

Appendix

Excerpts From Address of Hon. Antonio De Las Alas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a very informative address delivered by Hon. Antonio De Las Alas before the annual meeting of Philippine Mahogany Association, Inc., held at Boulder, Colo., July 16-20, 1961. I think it will be of interest to many of our citizens.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS OF HON. ANTONIO DE LAS ALAS

An unexpected event about the end of the last century brought the United States to the Philippines. Having struggled for freedom from a colonizing country, we could not accept domination by any other nation so we resisted tenaciously America's design to occupy the Philippines. But the struggle was so unequal that after a brief skirmish we had to bow to American sovereignty. We soon understood the American motives and objectives. America did not mean to colonize the Philippines, but rather their policy was to prepare us for self-government with a view to eventually granting our independence. The Americans, with the hearty cooperation of the Filipinos, embarked in the complicated task of preparing our country and people for independent nationhood. We worked together in perfect harmony and understanding, and this developed a genuine, sincere relationship of respect, admiration, and love for one another. During the First World War the Philippines showed her support and adherence to the cause for which the United States was fighting by individual Filipinos enlisting with freedom armies in Europe and the Philippines, organizing and offering a complete army division to the United States.

In 1934 the Tydings-McDuffie law was approved by the Congress of the United States and this law expressly provided for the granting of independence to the Philippines. However, although politically speaking, the Philippines was prepared for a complete and absolute independent existence, it was believed by Filipino and American statesmen that there should be a transition period during which this country could build up its economy and at the same time free itself from too much dependence upon the U.S. market. The Commonwealth government was set up in 1936 and the law provided that, after 10 years, the Commonwealth would cease and the Philippine Republic must then be established and recognized. But in 1940 the Second World War broke out, resulting in the occupation of the Philippines by Japan during the years 1941 to 1944. In this Second World War the Filipinos played a very important role.

Together with the American soldiers they fought against the Japanese invaders. They were able to hold the invaders for over 4 months in Bataan and Corregidor and this undoubtedly spoiled the timetable of the Japanese and enabled the Allied armies to organize and prepare for the counteroffensive. The successful Philippine-American resistance could be considered the turning point of the war in the Pacific. After the formal surrender of the American and Philippine Armies, the Filipinos engaged in guerrilla warfare which softened the resistance of the Japanese Army when the American Armed Forces returned to liberate the Philippines.

Since the economic preparation of the Philippines was interrupted by the war, the free trade between the two countries was continued but, by law and agreements like the Laurel-Langley agreement, a schedule of gradual liquidation of the free trade between the two countries was agreed upon.

In the meanwhile, aid in various forms was extended to the Philippines the most notable of which was the war damage payments. Up to now assistance is being given through American organizations like the International Cooperation Administration (ICA). So far we have not asked for any increase in the volume or amount of the aid, nor protested against any reduction, and much less resorted to a sort of extortion to get greater assistance like what some countries do.

Then there is that colossal struggle between communism and dictatorship on the one hand and democracy and freedom on the other. Again the Philippines joined the United States in this struggle. She demonstrated her unstinted support, not only in the diplomatic field—in the United Nations and international conferences—but even in the battlefields, the Philippines having participated in the Korean war. This struggle is even more dangerous as it may penetrate into the very heart of any nation in the form of internal subversion. The modus operandi is to cause discontentment and armed conflicts among the population and attain control of the country by encouraging and actually helping with arms and sometimes even with men the party or faction that embraces or favors the Communist ideology. Poverty and unemployment breed discontent and cause subversion which the Communists take advantage of to seize power and expand their sphere of influence or domination.

If the United States wishes the noble experiment she undertook when the Philippines was granted independence to be concluded successfully; if she intends to fulfill her obligation of rehabilitating the Philippines by repairing the losses and damages caused by the ravages of the last world war, and if she does not want the Philippines to be another hotbed of Communist propaganda and subversive activities and, on the contrary, she expects this country to be strong and in condition always to collaborate with her, she must make every endeavor to help the Philippines so that this country's economy will be sound and stable and the Filipino people happy and contented.

Barely 2 months ago the Filipino people was shocked by an unjust treatment perpetrated by the Department of Agriculture of the U.S. Government in connection with the allocation of sugar quota. Instead of describing this incident myself, let me quote

a news item published in a Manila newspaper. It reads as follows:

"Oland D. Russell of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, in an editorial in the New York World-Telegram of June 16, 1961 questioned the American decision to award additional sugar quotas to India and Brazil, affirmed neutral countries, because this was done at the expense of the Philippines, a stanch ally. Russell expressed the fear that even Brazil and India may not be impressed if they were to realize that friends like the Philippines are being taken for granted by the United States of America. These two neutrals, Russell said, would know that the moment they became 'friends' and not 'uncommitted,' they'd be treated as the Philippines is being treated now."

This hasty decision was later rectified by restoring to the Philippines its rightful share of 150,000 tons of additional quota. But the Philippine quota is still relatively small.

Notwithstanding regrettable failings on the part of America, not the least doubt should be entertained that the Philippines will always be a faithful and belligerent ally of America in so far as the fight for democracy and freedom as against communism and dictatorship is concerned. I am sure you have read the accounts of how warmly and sincerely our people welcomed General MacArthur during our Independence Day celebration on July 4. This, to my mind, demonstrates the continuing deep affection of the Filipinos toward the American people. But we hope and expect that no facts inimical to the economy of the Philippines will be committed.

With prosperity and contentment of the Filipinos and the Philippines enjoying a stable economy, America and the Philippines will continue marching together toward a world characterized by enjoyment of untrammeled freedom.

Another Administration Proposal That Hits Those of Moderate Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, is it not interesting that most of the administration proposals which are supposed to help the cherished common man of the New Deal, Fair Deal, and New Frontier always end up hitting hardest at those of modest income? The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal emphasizes this point in treating how the recently passed bill to lower the customs allowance will work in actual practice:

LETTER TO AUNT BESSIE

Well, we suppose the only thing you can do now is to cut your trip short by a week or write home for more money.

The President of the United States and the Congress, duly assembled, have decided that after September 9 your customs allowance

will be only \$100 instead of the \$500 it was when you left. So unless you hurry the customs collector is going to charge you extra for the privilege of bringing home those keepsakes and gifts you've been saving for all those years. And the collector has already warned that he's going to give your luggage a good ransacking to be sure you aren't smuggling lace from Brussels and thus undermining the Republic.

The reason for all this is quite simple. True, American foreign trade has been running a nice surplus but it just hasn't been big enough to cover both your tourist purchases and the Government's own dollar payments abroad, including all the billions for foreign aid. So the United States is running a huge deficit in its total balance of payments with foreign countries—the Government estimates it will be about \$1.5 billion this year alone, maybe more.

This means that somebody has got to cut down on oversea spending, and naturally the Government isn't. Of course if you and all the other tourists together don't bring back anything at all it still wouldn't make much of a dent in the balance of payments; in fact, if you take the \$400 difference and spend it on that side trip to Scotland, the payments deficit won't be reduced by a nickel. But, as the President reminded us, these are trying times. And somebody has to make sacrifices, don't they?

It's all a bit futile, and we suppose it's bound to strike you as unfair. But that's the way it is. When a government has indulged in years of foolishness and has gotten things so snarled up that great sacrifices are demanded—well, it somehow always turns out that the sacrifices are never for statesmen but only for Aunt Bessie.

Justice Clark Bids Bar Group Act To Halt Antitrust Violations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark, in a significant speech before the antitrust section of the American Bar Association, warned recently that stiff criminal penalties for aggravated violations of the antitrust laws would probably become commonplace.

He suggested that lawyers might best serve their clients and the national interest if they borrowed from the medical profession and adopted a policy of "preventive law," thus insuring more wholehearted compliance with the laws against monopoly and illegal competition.

Justice Clark declared that in 1961:

For the first time in Sherman law history reputable, top-level businessmen were sentenced and served a term in jail. One of the lawyers in addressing the court at the time of sentencing his client said: "Why punish these men? It's a way of life. Everybody's doing it."

In sum he concluded that no one would sentence a reputable businessman to jail with common crooks. Neither the National Association of Manufacturers nor the chamber of commerce ever reprimanded an indicted member company. In truth many saw nothing wrong in them.

But certainly every lawyer and every businessman knew that the conduct engaged in by these electrical manufacturers was a crime punishable by a jail sentence, by a fine, or both.

Lawyers, I believe, can have a large part in making sure it will not happen again. They can borrow from the technique of the doctor who has developed a preventive medicine program for his patients. Lawyers must adopt the same principle of a preventive law program that will make certain that hard-core violations of the act will at least be eliminated.

If [they] do not, more businessmen may find themselves in jail.

I include here the text of my bill, H.R. 4176, to provide additional punishment for corporate officers violating the antitrust laws, and to provide that such officers may be barred for not more than 1 year from serving in such corporate capacity.

I include, too, an article from the New York Times of August 9, 1961, and a letter I have received from the distinguished and indefatigable vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, George J. Burger, the ablest representative small business has ever had:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whoever is convicted of any violation of the antitrust laws may, in the discretion of the court, in addition to any other punishment provided by law, be barred for not more than one year from serving, directly or indirectly, in the capacity of officer, director, executive, legal counsel, or in any similar capacity with any corporation or corporations convicted in the same proceeding, and serving with any corporation engaged in interstate commerce, and from directly or indirectly receiving any compensation, remuneration, or other consideration therefor, or by way of indemnification for being so barred.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act the term "antitrust laws" has the meaning assigned to such term in the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914, and includes the Federal Trade Commission Act.

NATIONAL FEDERATION
OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Burlingame, Calif., August 9, 1961.
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Early in the present Congress when I conferred with you as to the advisability of reintroducing legislation to amend the antitrust laws—such legislation was introduced in the 2d session of the 86th Congress by you—I stated that the need for such legislation to strengthen the antitrust laws was even more necessary than ever before. That is, if we are to have respect and obedience to the antitrust laws from all segments of our economy.

Bear in mind, my action in the first instance was confirmed by the nationwide membership of the national federation in the 50 States, now numbering 171,947, all independent business and professional men, all individual members.

You agreed with our request resulting in reintroduction of the bill in the present Congress, H.R. 4176. Your bill provides for removal of officers for violation of the antitrust laws.

From its inception the national federation has made its No. 1 objective to protect the

free enterprise system and independent business, through vigorous consistent enforcement of the antitrust laws in all segments of our economy. Our action was confirmed in our public appearances before the respective platform committees of both the Democratic and Republican National Conventions 1948, 1952, 1956, and 1960. In fact that was the first recommendation, in each instance, that we made to the respective platform committees.

The importance of your legislative action as outlined in H.R. 4176 is most necessary when one stops to review the remarks of Mr. Justice Clark before the American Bar Association in annual convention in St. Louis, Mo., August 8, 1961, "Justice Clark Bids Bar Group Act To Halt Antitrust Violations."

Because of the importance of his remarks I am attaching herewith a clipping from the New York Times of August 9, and would it be possible to insert it in the Appendix of the Record? I believe such action would furnish important information to many of your colleagues as to Justice Clark's views.

Finally, Congressman, we did not call the turn wrong when we advised the House Small Business Committee in 1948 that antitrust violations were more rampant both at the local and national level than ever in the history of our Nation.

Thanking you for your usual cooperation in behalf of small business.

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

JUSTICE CLARK BIDS BAR GROUP ACT TO HALT ANTITRUST VIOLATIONS
(By Cabell Phillips)

ST. LOUIS, August 8.—Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark warned today that stiff criminal penalties for aggravated violations of the antitrust laws would probably become commonplace.

He suggested that lawyers might best serve their clients and the national interest if they borrowed from the medical profession and adopted a policy of "preventive war." This, he said, would insure more wholehearted compliance with the laws against monopoly and illegal competition.

Justice Clark was the principal luncheon speaker at the antitrust section of the American Bar Association, whose annual convention entered its second day here today. The sessions will continue through Friday.

In other groups meetings today James M. Landis, special assistance to President Kennedy an organization of the regulatory agencies, pleaded for continued reform in the administration of these agencies. Postmaster General J. Edward Day stated the case for postal rate increases. Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland urged a cooperative attitude toward the work of the United Nations. And a panel on criminal law debated the probable efficacy of the Attorney General's new attack on organized crime racketeering.

FORTY-FIVE HUNDRED MEMBERS AT HAND

The convention has brought more than 11,000 visitors to this city, approximately 4,500 of whom are A.B.A. members. More than a dozen different sections and panels on specialized problems of the legal professions are in session at any given time during the morning and afternoon hours and hotel facilities separated by as much as 3 or 4 miles have been pressed into use.

In his address Justice Clark traced the slow evolution of antitrust enforcement from its earliest application under President Theodore Roosevelt when it scandalized many right-thinking people, including Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, through two decades of desuetude during the 1920's and 1930's to the present. In 1961, he said, there began a new record.

"For the first time in Sherman Law history," he went on, "reputable top-level busi-

nessmen were sentenced and served a term in jail. One of the lawyers in addressing the court at the time of sentencing his client said: "Why punish these men? It's a way of life. Everybody's doing it."

"In sum he concluded that no one would sentence a reputable businessman to jail with common crooks. Neither the National Association of Manufacturers nor the chamber of commerce ever reprimanded an indicted member company. In truth many saw nothing wrong in them.

"But certainly," Justice Clark continued, "every lawyer and every businessman knew that the conduct engaged in by these electrical manufacturers was a crime punishable by a jail sentence, by a fine or both.

"Lawyers, I believe, can have a large part in making sure it will not happen again. They can borrow from the technique of the doctor who had developed a preventive medicine program for his patients. Lawyers must adopt the same principle of a preventive law program that will make certain that hard core violations of the act will at least be eliminated.

"If [they] do not, more businessmen may find themselves in jail."

Justice Clark's talk was regarded as one of the "toughest" heard so far at the convention and there was considerable comment about it today among the delegates.

LOBBIES UNDER ATTACK

Mr. Landis, in his address to the section on administrative law, castigated lobbies and other special interest groups for seeking to cripple or defeat the plans for reorganizing the Federal regulatory agencies.

Such proposals on which he has worked as a special assistant to President Kennedy have gone to Congress in the form of proposed actions under the Reorganization Act of 1949. Two have been accepted in modified form and two have been rejected.

Referring specifically to the defeat of the proposal for reforms in procedures of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. Landis said:

"An analysis of that event throws considerable light on the general problem of administrative reorganization. All the networks, the National Association of Broadcasters, the Federal Communications bar, opposed this reorganization plan.

"Their opposition stemmed not from a belief that the plan would not work but that it would work too well. Their fears related to the potentiality that the license renewal requirements might really be made workable.

Wisconsin Dairy Champions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in agriculture a difficult problem—in addition to the economic one—has been that of persuading young people to pursue farming as a career. In effect, it has been hard to keep them down on the farm.

We recognize, of course, that low income—in comparison with other vocations—is one of the influencing factors. To many people farming, however, is more than a vocation—it is a way of life.

Consequently, it is gratifying to see that despite the obstacles, a number of

outstanding, promising youth are taking up farming as a career.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published a number of articles reflecting the way in which young folks, for example, are participating in fair demonstrations—the culmination of year-round projects.

I ask unanimous consent to have the articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY YOUTHS ARE GIVING FAIR DEMONSTRATIONS

The mechanical head of a model Guernsey cow nodded, seemingly in agreement with the advice that two 17-year-old Buffalo County youths were giving a group of State fair visitors.

Delmar Plank of Alma, and David Putz of Fountain City, lecturing on the proper selection of foundation animals for a dairy herd, are among the 120 youths giving 360 demonstrations scheduled in the agriculture building during the fair.

The building comes alive early each morning as 4-H Club members, Future Farmers of America and Future Homemakers of America stream in to prepare their demonstration areas.

Using the model Guernsey and charts, Delmar and David demonstrated points they have picked up on cattle selection from their FFA project.

"When starting a herd look for an animal with a straight back," David told the audience as Delmar ran a pointer along the Guernsey's back to emphasize the remark.

Both youths moved cautiously through the presentation; besides the audience, there was a judge out front. He was there to make certain they had a sound knowledge of their subject and that it was presented clearly and in well organized manner.

Hoping to win a blue ribbon, the youths said they had been working on this particular project since February. Both have been meeting at the Cochrane-Fountain City High School Sundays and evenings, shaping the presentation and planning visual aids.

Like the other youths, they were selected to appear at the State fair after winning in competition in their home area.

Their work was rewarded when they won a blue ribbon for their presentation. It was a duplication of last year's feat, when the two teamed up to demonstrate how to clean and trim cows.

Typical of the girls demonstrating at the fair was Donna Newman, 16, Wisconsin Dells, who gave tips on traveling.

"Pack the things you need first—last. And the things you need last—first," she said.

"Always take a needle and thread. You never know when you'll rip a dress. Be prepared."

THREE ARE NAMED AS DAIRY WINNERS

The last three dairy champions of the State Fair's junior division were selected Monday with two of the titles going to girls.

Rhoda Sayre, 17, a 4-H Club girl from Edgerton, showed the champion milking shorthorn. Her winner, a pure white 3-year-old, was champion of the fair last year.

A pretty 19-year-old University of Wisconsin home economics major was the winner in the Jersey division. She is Barbara Howell of Waukesha, who won with her 6-year-old cow, How Blie. Miss Howell said this year would wind up her 4-H Club activities. She has shown the cow for 6 years.

The Ayrshire winner was John Dalton, 18, of Hartland.

CENTERS ON TWO FAMILIES

The milking shorthorn contest Monday boiled down mostly to representatives from two families. They were Kitchell Sayre's daughter, Rhoda, and four children of Leslie Gerner, Whitewater—Gayle, 13; Vicki, 15; Edwin, 17, and Nancy, 19.

Gayle got the Gerners off to a fast start, winning the junior heifer class. Nancy followed with the winner in the senior heifer class, defeating not only Miss Sayre but her own sister, Vicki.

But Rhoda came back to take the junior yearling heifer class and the aged cow title. Edwin Gerner won in 2-year-olds.

The showmen then squared off for the championships. Gayle Gerner won the junior award. Judge Els Knutson, Oconomowoc, normally associated with Holsteins, liked the Gerner heifer. But with its immaturity he said he didn't want to stick his neck out. He gave the purple ribbon to Miss Sayre.

The Jersey showmen put on a classy display. They had their tidy animals brushed to perfection, with curved horns glistening. The Jerseys may be outnumbered by other breeds, but their sleek lines and alertness make them a favorite with spectators.

Jersey class winners were: Junior heifer calf, Carol Venoric, Kenosha; senior heifer calf, Miss Howell; junior yearling heifer, Oren Hammes, Jr., Edgerton; senior yearling heifer, Harlon Frost, Hudson; 2-year-old heifer, David McClurg, Gays Mills; 3-year-old cow, Hammes; aged cow, Miss Howell, and junior champion, McClurg.

Dalton's award climaxed 3 years of showing. His cow was State champion here in 1959 and first prize 2-year-old in 1960.

Other Ayrshire winners were: Junior heifer calf, Dalton; senior heifer calf, Steven Justman, Unity (Clark County); junior yearling heifer, Dalton; senior yearling heifer, Allan Benicke, Cedarburg; 2-year-old heifer, Kemp Wilson, Mukwonago; 3-year-old cow, Wilson, and aged cows, Dalton.

In bulls, James Thomey, Kenosha, had the title on a senior calf. No Jersey or Ayrshire bulls were shown.

Miss Howell climaxed the day by winning a new class, for all-breed showmanship. Dalton was second.

To find the winner, the judge switched animals among the showmen. When Miss Howell was given a Holstein to lead, she did a better job than the others with unfamiliar animals.

The final decision was based on the fact that Miss Howell could stop her animal as if it were posed for a picture. That means having the right rear foot forward for a good view of the udder and keeping the back straight.

JEFFERSON COUNTY WINS

Jefferson County won the herdsman contest, given for the best job of displaying cattle in the barns. Sheboygan got an award among counties with less than 20 entries and Jefferson the prize for larger counties, then took the overall trophy for dairy cattle. Iowa County won in beef herdsman.

Into the rating go scores on general appearance and neatness of exhibits, conduct of exhibitors, attendant on duty, storage of feed and equipment, and type and quality of cattle.

Jefferson's stalls, even at the end of the junior fair, were squared off neatly, with deep, clean bedding in place. The youths had decorated the entire area with deep blue paper, lettered in white. Over each animal was hung the ribbon it had received.

Jefferson County also won the shepherd trophy for having the best decorated and cleanest sheep pens during the junior fair. Dunn County finished second, and Fond du Lac County third. Jefferson County also took the traveling award in 1959. With one more victory the trophy will be theirs to keep.

Flood Protection Preferable to Flood Relief

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, the subject of flood control is of vital importance to many Members of Congress I am sure. I have for some time now been an advocate of effective flood control and protection devices that would prevent that type of flood damage that occurred in my own Eighth District of Indiana during the month of May. At that time, thousands of dollars of damage was suffered by communities and individuals living in southern Indiana, and in the general tri-state area of southern Indiana, Illinois, and western Kentucky. I appeared before both the House and Senate Subcommittees on Public Works of the respective Appropriations Committees, strongly urging further starts and work on the various flood control projects on the Ohio, Wabash, and the White and Patoka River systems. A recent editorial appearing in the Evansville Courier, of Evansville, Ind., points out what I believe to be the only really wise solution to this problem of annual flooding and human suffering. Under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

FLOOD PROTECTION PREFERABLE TO FLOOD RELIEF

President Kennedy has authorized the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to spend \$950,000 in emergency flood relief for 43 Indiana counties, including all of southwestern Indiana.

That represents just a portion of the damage that was done to public facilities—roads, bridges, sewers, and the like—by torrential rains early this summer. For Vanderburgh County alone, there is an application for \$104,000, mostly as a result of those spectacular downtown sewer cave-ins.

Private loss as a result of the floods was far greater. Some of it was paid for by private agencies, some by individual owners, and some by insurance companies.

Without detracting a bit from the need for this assistance, it should be noted that this is literally money down the drain. The Federal Government will spend close to a million dollars simply to get things back in some sort of normal order. None of the money will go for significant improvement of public facilities.

Nor is it likely that this will be the last expense of this type in southern Indiana. It could be next year, or 5 years from now, or 10 years from now. But sooner or later there are bound to be more floods, and more emergency appropriations for flood damage.

The size of this year's bill helps to put the Federal Government's annual expenses for flood protection in context. A dollar spent in flood relief is gone forever. It has done nothing except replace something that already existed.

A dollar's worth of flood protection, on the other hand, can be expected to pay for itself time and time again. Sometimes a levee system can pay for itself by containing a single surge of high water. When the water recedes, the levees are still there, an investment in future protection.

The annual expenditures for flood control look immense when they've listed on a single-page summary of congressional appropriations. However, a little reflection is enough to convince most citizens that next to defense, the money is about as well spent as any in our Federal budget.

Dewey Hodges Johnson: His Faith in Future of South Carolina Will Live On

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate the praiseworthy and exceptional career of the late Dewey Hodges Johnson, of Greenwood, S.C.

Throughout his life, Dewey Johnson devoted his time and talents unselfishly and devotedly to civic, religious, humanitarian, and financial programs of our State. His achievements have contributed greatly to the public good and have earned him the respect, admiration, and gratitude of all South Carolinians. I join my fellow citizens in extending sympathy to his family, friends, and associates.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the August 15 issue of the Anderson Independent of Anderson, S.C., entitled "Dewey Hodges Johnson: His Faith in Future of South Carolina Will Live On," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEWEY HODGES JOHNSON: HIS FAITH IN FUTURE OF SOUTH CAROLINA WILL LIVE ON

Summer days on Broad Street in Augusta generate a peculiar heat of their own. To move about at all is to sweat. To have been a bank runner back in the early 1900's called for pluck, energy, and plenty of perspiration.

Some youngsters in such jobs tossed in the towel, even as too many do today when the going gets a little rugged.

But Dewey Hodges Johnson, a native of Aiken who got a job as a bank runner in Augusta after he was graduated from high school in 1917, wasn't that kind.

His career, which came to an untimely end at the age of 62 when he died in Greenwood, is a model of the American story—from lowly bank runner to chairmanship of the board of the State Bank and Trust Co. with 19 thriving offices in South Carolina, the largest State bank in the State.

His first job as runner with the Citizens and Southern National Bank of Augusta was just the beginning of 24 years with that institution. He wasn't a runner for long. He was interested in banking and, especially, in the idea—strange idea it was not too many years ago—that the character of an individual was far more trustworthy than collateral.

He was the type of banker who was an acute judge of such character. Whether the applicant for a loan wore overalls or a top hat, the Dewey Johnson practice as it developed over the years was to judge the individual not by any "front" but upon his reputation for reliability, intent, and willingness to work.

The bank runner in time became vice

president of the Augusta banking house, joined Auto Finance Co. of Charlotte, and then in 1943 took over control of the Bank of Greenwood, which name later was changed to State Bank and Trust Co. as new offices were opened first in smaller communities in Greenwood vicinity and then expanded to become truly a statewide banking service.

Increasingly, this banking service became a sparkplug in the financial dynamo, helping to produce new businesses and industrial plants in all parts of the State. All such enterprises—large or small—were encouraged and given full assistance, good times and bad, based on the same judgment—reliability and characters of owners and prospects for success, often in fields some lenders with less vision wouldn't have touched with a 10-foot pole.

Meanwhile, Mr. Johnson devoted much time and effort to civic and community affairs not only in his adopted home town of Greenwood but wherever his banking offices are located, since he believed in his business being a "good citizen" dedicated to upbuilding of State, town, and community.

It would require more space than available to detail the many good works this man performed during his career and typically, a great many of them were hidden under the bushel. Dewey Johnson was no seeker of publicity for himself.

Especially poignant to many Andersonians is that State Bank & Trust opened its most recent office in Anderson only a few months ago, fulfilling a longtime desire by Mr. Johnson to have his banking services established in this thriving Hartwell Dam area. It was a happy day for him and for Anderson, and will be long remembered.

As an able and astute banker, Mr. Johnson built well, and his sons and other associates throughout the State may be depended upon to carry on in the progressive and friendly traditions he established so well.

As one longtime Greenwood friend said, "Dewey Johnson was one of those rare men—a real friend to everybody."

He will be keenly missed. Our sympathy goes out to his family, and to his friends and associates. They and all other South Carolinians may be both consoled and encouraged by remembering that Dewey Johnson demonstrated a deep faith in the future of South Carolina and its people which is a living force that will continue to have incalculable impact.

Tomorrow's Public Servants

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, in the face of all the problems which have confronted this Congress, it is refreshing for me to know that at the center for practical politics, Rollins College, in my district, a distinguished program is being carried on as a contribution to America's public leadership. Just let me mention a few of the young men who this summer have been engaged in strenuous internships to train their skills and test their capabilities.

Howell W. Van Gerbig, Jr., grandson of Ogden Mills, a former Secretary of the Treasury, is in Japan, studying the rela-

tionship of Japan's economic objectives to foreign policy. Mr. Van Gerbig, as you know, is himself a leading metropolitan golf amateur from Long Island and Palm Beach. Robert K. Brown, Springfield, Mass., has been working in the personnel offices of the New York Port Authority and is writing a manual on public personnel administration. Thomas Donnelly, Pittsburgh, Pa., is completing a study of the constitutions of the Americas and this fall will issue a collection of documents with organizational charts. Douglas Baxendale, Swansea, Mass., is engaged in making an economic study of Greater Fall River, looking forward to making contributions toward its industrial growth. Richard Rhodes, of Winter Park, Fla., is in personnel in the city of Orlando. And Rohn Lady, who was elected to the council of the town of Casselberry, Fla., at the age of 21, is serving as the administrative officer of the center for practical politics, coordinating studies which are in progress dealing with the central Florida region.

This kind of preparation of tomorrow's leaders by resultful internships is an encouraging sign of the times with a global reach.

Russians Conduct Economic Espionage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, should there be any doubt about the totality of the Soviet offensive being directed against the West, the following article by Victor Riesel, describing the extent of Communist espionage in Europe, should bring us to our senses.

Can there be any doubt that similar spying operations are taking place daily within our shores? What Mr. Riesel's article also reveals is that the Russians, despite their claims of superiority, actually need the technological and mechanical information which they steal from western businessmen. Besides aiding the Reds in developing better machinery, basic information about our research and development progress gives them a good idea about our military strategy. The article follows:

RUSSIANS CONDUCT ECONOMIC ESPIONAGE
(By Victor Riesel)

MUNICH.—Plastic bombings in Frankfort and a midnight execution by revolver shots on a wooded roadside not far from Lisbon have been the trademarks of the Soviet counterintelligence operation in the last 2 weeks.

Today, all across Europe, but especially in Germany, the Communist underground is preparing for Der Tag. In a special room in a special headquarters of the German Republic's security forces there is a huge map with pins marking the concentration of Moscow's underground agents—and the pins in the map show the Russians have 16,000 special agents operating in West Germany.

Of these, some 4,000 are women. One of them, Rosalie Kunze, was nabbed along with

some 200 other agents "our side" picks up every day. She had all the equipment for the job: A false bottom purse, a hairbrush with a hollow handle for microfilms, undergarments into which she could slip edible tissue-paper reports.

Her first assignment was in a field the Soviet intelligence people give high priority—economic and industrial espionage. Her task was to contact and entertain, if possible, West German and French businessmen visiting the Soviet-zone Leipzig Fair. She was eventually arrested for soliciting—vital information which would give Russian analysts detailed knowledge of classified production this side of the line.

As the Landesamt fuer Verfassungsschutz (Office For Protection of the Constitution) put it recently in one of its reports: "Experience shows that the fight for technical progress, for markets in economic areas of influence, is playing an important role in the political battle for power." The "Verfassungsschutz" is the FBI of West Germany.

What the Russians want is all the information they can get on Western automatic machinery (the Soviets have virtually none compared with the West); developments in chemical industries; basic research in nuclear physics and electronics. These are the main targets. Also information concerning "secret construction plans, patented production procedures and individual models of items produced."

If the Soviet underground apparatus should succeed in gathering such data in Europe, it would lead the Moscow intelligence people directly to our own secret production installations, for we work closely with our allies.

So it isn't merely a cloak and dagger search for a death ray we may have closeted somewhere. If the enemy knows what we're making, or in what direction our secret basic research and development is going, they'll know what our basic strategy will be. And since so many firms back home are doing business with the bloc countries and are exchanging pleasant visits across the sea with bloc businessmen, I thought you folks back home would like to know what German intelligence has discovered:

All Czechoslovakian businessmen are given precise instructions in writing before they leave their country for Germany, France, or the United States, for that matter.

Each Soviet bloc buying agent, inspector, salesman, or trade commission member must file a travel report on his return. This goes into a vast global blackmail warehouse of personal dossiers.

Each itinerant Soviet bloc businessman must bring back with him detailed information on the type and volume of the production of the factories he visited. He must submit proposals for the evaluation of the information he obtained.

And, each of these visitors must describe his Western business contacts—this means their looks, peculiarities, and personal weaknesses.

Similar instructions are given to Soviet bloc inspectors of goods bought in the West, including the United States, and to all members of economic delegations. Frequently these inspectors, purchasing agents, and members of economic and trade delegations stay in Western countries for a month or more, perhaps several months.

Remember this, some of you folks back home, when you are dealing with a gracious, good humored bloc businessman. It's his life or your proclivities. He must report them. Remember that personal contacts are established not only with top executives, but with aids all the way down the line.

The German intelligence office says bluntly it has evidence that such contacts are used for espionage, including economic espionage. At all times bloc travelers are on the look-

out for personnel who can be blackmailed into yielding industrial secrets, either because of personal habits or because of a relative behind the Iron Curtain.

Spying isn't always a microfilm and secret wireless operation. Beware the Russians and Czechs and all the rest of them who come bearing gifts in the form of orders. The dossier you build up may be your own.

Equalitarian Dogma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Equalitarian Dogma," by Henry E. Garrett, Ph. D. Dr. Garrett is one of the outstanding psychologists of our Nation and has served as president of the national association. Teaching at Columbia University from 1923 to 1941, he became head of the department of psychology there and continued in that position until 1956. Since that time, he has been a visiting professor at the University of California, the University of Southern California, the University of California at Los Angeles, the University of Hawaii, the University of New Mexico, the University of Florida, and is now a visiting professor of psychology at the University of Virginia.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch,
Aug. 13, 1961]

EQUALITARIAN DOGMA RACIAL DIFFERENCES
DISCUSSED

(By Henry E. Garrett, Ph.D.)

Up to World War I, it is probable that American scientists who gave the matter any thought at all believed the Negro race to be natively less gifted than the white. Thus, the Negro was generally considered to be less intelligent and more indolent than the white, and to be somewhat lacking in the fundamental traits of honesty and reliability. This judgment was concurred in by most white Americans.

Social scientists today do not often accept these onetime commonsense judgments. Instead, they hold that racial differences are skindepth: that, whereas the black African differs from the white European in the breadth and depth of his civilization, there are no genetic or native factors to account for these differences; that all races are potentially equal in ability and differ only in their opportunity to achieve. Usually, the social scientist will include motivation as a cause of racial differences, together with discrimination and prejudice.

This view that, except for environmental differences, all races are potentially equal has been called the equalitarian dogma. (Use of the word "equalitarian" in this paper is limited to the meaning indicated above. I do not intend the broader meaning: that of belief that all men should have equal political and social rights, a concept not debated here.)

It has spread through many of our colleges and universities and is widely accepted by sincere humanitarians, social reformers, crusaders, sentimentalists and—

ostensibly—politicians. Many ministers of religion, convinced that the concept of the "equality of man" is in keeping with the ideals of Christian brotherhood and democracy, have joined the social scientists. Last, but by no means least, the Communists vigorously defend the equalitarian dogma. Only the man in the street, uninstructed in social anthropology, remains puzzled and reluctant.

Equalitarianism—or egalitarianism, as it is sometimes called—finds its chief support from at least two clearly identifiable sources: the allegedly scientific groups who have proved equality, and the religious groups who accept this proof and, on the basis of it, assert that belief in racial differences implies superiority and inferiority and is unchristian, shameful and blameworthy.

Each camp supplements the other. The social scientists turn to moral denunciation when their evidence is feeble, and the religious fall back on science to bolster up their ethical preachers. From these two directions the American people have for more than 30 years been subjected to a barrage of propaganda unrivaled in its intensity and self-righteousness.

Today in many departments of psychology, anthropology, and even genetics, the equalitarian dogma has been installed as a major premise not to be questioned. Budding young scientists of independent mind jeopardize their careers by challenging the dogma and may be silenced by strong disapproval.

Many college students have been indoctrinated and parrot the equalitarian arguments without competent familiarity with the evidence, shifting from the scientific to the moralistic position as the occasion requires.

The northern press and many influential magazines, together with radio and TV programs, confidently proclaim equalitarianism.

How can we account for today's shift from a general belief in native racial differences to acceptance of the equalitarian dogma?

There are, I believe, five sources which have stimulated and directed the propaganda barrage mentioned above. Let us examine these in order:

INFLUENCE OF MODERN ANTHROPOLOGY

By far the most potent assault upon native racial differences from the scientific side has come from the work of Franz Boas, who may be thought of as the father of the equalitarian movement.

Boas came to this country from Germany in 1886 and for 37 years—1899–1936—was professor of anthropology at Columbia University. Boas and his followers actively and aggressively championed equalitarianism, discounting any evidence tending to show that Negro-white differences may not be environmentally determined. But the cultural anthropologists rarely use objective measures recognized as valid for judging the comparative abilities of racial groups. Hence their conclusions, though confidently announced, are often subjective and unconvincing.

The view presented here is that psychological tests offer the best—i.e., most valid—quantitative data for the determination of racial differences.

The best recent survey of the comparative standing of American Negroes and American whites on a number of mental tests may be found in "Testing of Negro Intelligence," a book written by A. M. Shuey, published in 1958. It is indicative of the power—and lack of tolerance—of the equalitarians that none of the university presses to which this book was submitted was willing to publish it. This book covers 44 years, from 1913 to 1957, and analyzes some 240 studies.

Negro-white comparisons are made of preschool children, grade and high school pupils, college students, gifted and retarded children, soldiers, delinquents, racial hybrids, and Negro migrants. A brief summary of the relative findings follows:

1. The IQ's of American Negroes are from 15 to 20 points, on the average, below those of American whites.

2. Negro overlap of white median IQ's ranges from 10 to 25 percent—equality would require 50 percent.

3. About six times as many whites as Negroes fall in the "gifted child" category.

4. About six times as many Negroes as whites fall below 70 IQ—that is, in the feeble-minded group.

5. Negro-white differences in mean-test score occur in all types of mental tests, but the Negro lag is greatest in the tests of an abstract nature—for example, problems involving reasoning, deduction, comprehension. These are the functions called for in education above the lowest levels.

6. Differences between Negro and white children increase with chronological age, the gap in performance being the largest at the high school and college level.

7. Large and significant differences in favor of whites appear even when economic factors have been eliminated.

It seems clear that the evidence from psychometrics (intelligence testing) does not favor the equalitarian dogma; in fact, just the opposite.

HITLER AND THE NAZIS

Undoubtedly Hitler's unspeakable cruelties and absurd racial-superiority theories of the Nazis set up a favorable climate for the proponents of the equalitarian dogma.

It is easy for the equalitarian to argue the acceptance of the fact of racial differences is a forerunner of notions of racial superiority, discrimination, prejudice, and persecution.

The argument is fallacious. Recognition of differences in ability between men and women and between children and adults does not lead forthwith to prejudice and persecution; in fact, often the contrary is true. Recognition of the talents of many Negroes for sports and for various forms of entertainment has, if anything, improved the feelings of the white majority toward Negroes generally.

RISE OF AFRICAN NATIONALISM

The struggle for freedom and self-determination by the various peoples of Africa has aroused the sympathy of most of the people of the world and has undoubtedly strengthened the emotional appeal in the idea that all men are born equally endowed.

But emotionally founded belief can be deceptive. As is well known, the African Negro has been self-governing throughout most of his history, the colonial period being relatively short—only 80 years in the Belgian Congo.

In the several thousand years of recorded history, the black African has never constructed an alphabet, created a literature or a science, produced any great men, or built up a civilization.

Tonybee, the eminent British historian, has written that of the 21 great civilizations of the past, not one has been Negro.

To be sure, we are often reminded of the three kingdoms in West Africa which in the 12th century briefly attained a cultural level relatively high for that region. But these "magnificent civilizations," as the equalitarian anthropologists call them, were hardly on a par with the then flourishing civilizations of France, Italy, and the Near East.

Moreover, Timbuktu, with its allegedly great university, was Moslem and Arabic—not black African—and the university itself was little more than a large mosque with a few teachers.

SUPREME COURT DECISION, 1954

In May of 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down its decision on desegregation of the schools. This decree was hailed by proponents of the equalitarian dogma, who rightly regarded it as a great victory for their cause. Many people, however, were—and are—still confused by the

issue of legal and moral rights and their relation in biological and psychological differences.

COMMUNIST INFLUENCE

Undoubtedly the Communists—and their supporters—have aided in the spread and acceptance of the equalitarian dogma, although the extent and method of their aid is difficult to assess. Direct action as well as subversion are both in the Communist creed. Communists have used equalitarian dogma as a device to gain converts among underprivileged people, and also to foment trouble when possible. Many non-Communists hold the position that the free world must outdo the Communists in acceptance of this belief, and must reject any further inquiry into its validity.

It will be apparent that, in the writer's opinion, the weight of evidence is in favor of the proposition that racial differences in mental ability—and perhaps also in character—are innate and genetic. The story is not finished, and further inquiry is sorely needed.

Surely there are no scientific reasons why restrictions should be placed on further research. The equalitarian dogma, at best, represents a sincere if misguided effort to help the Negro by ignoring or even suppressing evidence of his mental and social immaturity. At worst, the equalitarian dogma is the scientific hoax of the century.

Grange Opposes S. 1123

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

MR. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, during the summer months in my district, thousands of children are employed to help harvest strawberries, raspberries, beans, flower bulbs, and other crops of these types. This serves two purposes. First, it provides the children with a constructive way to spend their school holidays and at the same time pays them well. Also, it relieves the farmers of my district from having to import more harvester from Canada and other areas.

I am one that believes that children should be protected and should not be allowed to work in occupations that might endanger their health or lives. But, also, I believe they should be given the chance to earn spending money in work that is healthful and useful.

There are others, Mr. Speaker, who agree. For example, the members of Ten Mile Grange have passed a resolution which sets forth the desirability of allowing children to harvest small fruits and row crops. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the resolution:

A RESOLUTION BY TEN MILE GRANGE NO. 399
AGAINST SENATE BILL 1123

Whereas U.S. Senate bill 1123 seeks to prohibit children under 16 years of age from helping in the harvesting of crops and other useful, profitable, and harmless summer-time work; and,

Whereas thousands of acres of small fruits and row crops planted each year, bring in millions of dollars to the economy of our Nation, and children are essential for this harvest; and,

Whereas the Justice Department decries the lack of occupation for children as a strong contributing factor toward a serious national juvenile delinquency problem; and

Whereas we are in support of Government regulations concerned with the protection of young children as regards dangerous and unhealthful occupations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Ten Mile Grange No. 399 go on record as opposing U.S. Senate bill 1123; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Washington State Grange, Whatcom County Pomona Grange, to Senators MAGNUSEN and JACKSON, to Representative WESTLAND, and to the State Grange News.

Adopted by Ten Mile Grange No. 399, July 28, 1961.

CARL G. ELSNER,
Master.
ARMIDA HOPFINGER,
Secretary.

Showdown in Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House an editorial from the August 15 edition of the Standard-Times, of New Bedford, Mass. Titled "Showdown in Berlin," this is a penetrating analysis—in straight-forward terms—of the present crisis in Germany:

SHOWDOWN IN BERLIN

The present crisis in Germany, in which West Berlin has been shut off to East Berliners and East Germans, was not caused either by the East German Government or the nations of the Soviet bloc's Warsaw Pact, as Communist news sources suggest.

The decision was made by Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union.

It violates the Four Power accord on free movement within Berlin which Russia signed with Britain, France, and the United States.

Why did Khrushchev do it, and particularly at this time?

He had come to the conclusion that the Western Powers would not join in any peace treaty that would recognize the division of Germany and that he must sign a separate agreement with the East Germans.

The knowledge that this treaty would be concluded about the end of the year produced Communist concern that the flight of East Germans into West Germany might reach dangerous and unmanageable proportions before the agreement was consummated.

It would be embarrassing to communism, to find itself possessed of a nation largely emptied of people who had cast their vote against Red rule "with their feet," by fleeing before it came to power.

Khrushchev has broken an international agreement.

He has perpetrated a cruel act upon the German people.

His action is threatening the peace of the world.

The Soviet Premier has dared anyone to question his right to do these things.

What he hopes is that the West will issue "vigorous protests," which he makes a habit of ignoring, and will eventually subside into acceptance.

Khrushchev hopes this because he wants to make other demands.

In the fall, he would like to negotiate with the Western Powers on their right of access to West Berlin.

In return for allowing them such access, which is not his to give or take away, he is expected to ask the Allied Nations to affirm the permanency of the present eastern frontier of East Germany, and to ban propaganda and similar activities in West Berlin that he contends are having a disruptive effect on East Germany.

If the West falters now, the results could be disastrous, not only for those Germans who ask the right to live under liberty, but for freemen the world over.

Chancellor Adenauer has assured Germans on both sides of the Iron Curtain that Bonn, with its allies, will take the necessary measures to counter the sealing off of West Berlin.

Adenauer should be supported in the position by Washington, Paris, and London standing firm and united.

the politicians. This is why they so often have trouble with it. And today we are witnessing every dodge and ball trick to circle this defense and in a mood, an intend of conquest. Thus, regardless of cause, the great oath of office becomes nothing more estimable than a ceremony.

The future comes one day at a time. There is absolutely no guarantee we can indefinitely withstand internal totalitarian encroachments. Totalitarianism means adherence to a single will, not necessarily a soldier or personal tyrant. Just one man. Democracies shatter themselves by blindness to this. The truth is the only hope: We are being deliberately manipulated further and further into such control. This is the eel under the rock and we had better see it. For the facts are indisputable and the truth can stop it if the public grasps the facts.

Back-door spending of billions in foreign aid without congressional control, sweeping Executive decrees having the effect of law without due process of law, multitudinous powerful Government agencies which report only to the President, attacks on the trinity of check and balances provided by the separation of Federal powers, the battle against the rights of the States; these are all symptoms of a deep malaise imposed on us.

Put into that malaise, as well, the systematic pressure for congressional votes by officers of public money for local projects, the juggling of judgeships and jobs, and nepotism, too, for that is being practiced, and the power-steering accessories are thus added to the totalitarian chassis.

None of these activities is needed by America. They are needed only by the men who perform them. And all are as inappropriate as if our Constitution's model had been Hinkey Dink and Bathhouse John in the river wards of Chicago.

Khrushchev flexes. We have a tough battle on our hands not only because the Red enemy is fierce and powerful but because the enemy is invisible and everywhere. The only proper test of men in public life today is whether they have courage enough to fight self-interest of all kinds, beginning with their own. There is some hope for this in Congress. But the immediate and decisive hope is in the President. "One man with courage makes a majority," said Andrew Jackson. The President can be that majority.

In the quiet accounting our President renders to himself, he can take stock at this perilous time, reverse his field, forget politics and 1964, and abandon the thrust toward welfare-state socialism, abandon partisan power plays and Government by indirect coercion, and see, as the fine patriot which he is, that these are intolerable now in the country he loves as much as any man alive.

Political Spending and the Battle Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an exceedingly able column written by Henry J. Taylor, entitled "We Are Burying Ourselves," published in the Richmond Times-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE ARE BURYING OURSELVES
(By Henry J. Taylor)

When Khrushchev said he would bury us, this man was crazy as a fox. We have the shovel. We are burying ourselves. If Khrushchev has any brains he will just do a Rip van Winkle and let us do the rest.

We are not fighting communism. We are promoting it by political spending which punches hard at self-reliance, programs which aggressively make State dependents out of larger and larger parts of our population, tax laws which to a major degree nationalize property and wages, and by the veiled dive into welfare-state socialism which is, in fact, the overall objective.

It is a matter of intent. And this is the intent. It is also the chassis of totalitarianism by any name, and any government in office by less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the majority has no mandate for it whatever.

When you think of socialism think of the force content of the plan. That's the key. And socialism's only proven advantage is to the planners themselves. It is notorious as a politician's paradise. It guarantees the planners power by its bribes for votes; supports "the love of governing," as Voltaire defined political ambition; and suits its intellectual jockeys' cynical dream that they are the brains and we are the horses.

If we do not intend to create free and independent citizens, the United States has gone to a great deal of trouble and expense for nothing. This is what the Constitution intended and we depend on everybody to recognize the worth.

Our Constitution was not written to limit the people. The people can always change the Constitution. It was written to limit

The National Lottery of Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the national lottery of Norway. In addition to the lottery, Norway also benefits from semiofficial football pools, which I would like to mention.

In 1960, the gross receipts of the national lottery came to \$14 million. The Government is obliged to pay out about

two-thirds of the gross receipts in prizes, so that the Government's net profit in 1960 was close to \$5 million.

Norway's football pools are controlled by the Government. They are operated by a semipublic company. The football pools are not an end in themselves but a means benefiting science and sport.

Interestingly enough, the football pools are supervised by the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Church Affairs. In Norway, it is recognized that the best way to control gambling is to admit its existence and seek to channel it. Are we too firmly in the clutches of hypocrites to escape the same realization?

Evolution of Nonviolence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article "Evolution of Nonviolence," by Carleton Mabee:

EVOLUTION OF NONVIOLENCE

(By Carleton Mabee)

The nonviolent movement for desegregation was born during World War II. The war created tensions which were sometimes transferred—often unconsciously—to hatred of minorities. At the same time, the Negroes' awareness of their second-class citizenship was heightened by the contrast between Jim Crow and the professed American war aim of opposition to the Nazi race theory. There was uneasiness in war plants, where white and colored often worked side by side for the first time.

In this situation, pacifists, once they had lost their effort to prevent U.S. entry into the war, decided to emphasize the development of nonviolent techniques to improve race relations. As they proceeded, they consciously learned from Gandhi, whose nonviolent movement for the independence of India was then reaching its climax.

As early as April, 1942, the pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation's youth secretary, Bayard Rustin, a young Negro of compelling charm, was trying one-man sit-ins. He believed that American Negroes were peculiarly fitted to experiment with nonviolent action, he said, because they not only had a history of enduring suffering without bitterness, but also a rich religious heritage of which non-violence was a part.

When Rustin went into a restaurant in a small midwestern town, the manager refused to serve him, because, she explained, if she did, "everybody would walk out." Rustin proposed that they try an experiment: he would sit at a table with a hamburger in front of him, and they both would watch for 10 minutes to see if anyone walked out because he was there. If anyone did, Rustin would also walk out. After some hesitation, the manager agreed to try the experiment. Rustin waited the 10 minutes without anyone's walking out, and then the manager served him a hot hamburger. Thereafter the restaurant continued to serve Negroes.

Rustin found other opportunities to refuse to cooperate with segregation. On a bus near Nashville, he sat up front with whites, was dragged out of the bus and

kicked, but did not retaliate. Attending a Quaker conference at Cape May, N.J., he appeared with white friends one afternoon at a "whites only" section of a beach. When guards asked him to go elsewhere he expressed concern for the difficult position of the guards. He explained that it was against his principles to acquiesce in segregation and therefore he could not willingly leave, but suggested various humorous ways by which they could remove him. The guards were so taken aback that they left him alone; during the rest of the conference, Rustin and his friends continued to use the beach. When he arrived late one rainy night by train in Baltimore, Rustin found that the taxi drivers at the station refused to pick him up because of his color. He walked into the middle of the narrow taxi driveway alongside the station, and stood there, blocking all taxi traffic for 90 minutes, until he got a taxi.

During 1942 Rustin described his one-man sit-ins, ride-ins, swim-ins and stand-ins to many audiences, and thus prepared the way for the organized nonviolent movement.

In February 1942, James Farmer, the young race relations secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, proposed to the fellowship that it attempt to create an organization, composed of both pacifists and nonpacifists, committed to nonviolent action against racial discrimination. It was hoped that, after a period of 5 to 10 years of education and experiment, the organization would be ready to use on a large scale "relentless noncooperation, economic boycott, and civil disobedience." In April 1942, the fellowship's national council decided to endorse such a campaign, and authorized Farmer to work on it. The decision was soon to bear fruit.

Meanwhile, among the several Fellowship of Reconciliation cell groups in Chicago, one, composed largely of University of Chicago students, was devoted to race relations. One evening two members of this group—Farmer, who is colored, and James Robinson, white—went into Jack Spratt's a restaurant in their neighborhood. They were served reluctantly. Later, a larger interracial party from the same cell also went into the restaurant. They were also served reluctantly; and after they had eaten, their waiter refused to give them a bill. They left money in payment, but the waiter followed them into the street to throw the money after them.

By this time the group working on Jack Spratt's had grown to include several non-students and nonpacifists. The enlarged group deliberately planned a non-violent demonstration, patterned on a combination of Gandhian methods and the methods of the 1936-37 sitdown strikes in auto factories (the sitters first called their demonstrations sitdown strikes), in an attempt to change the restaurant's policy.

One day in May 1942, the group sent an all-white party into Jack Spratt's, and it was served; then a mixed party went in, and was seated; finally, an all-Negro party entered. The hostess told the all-Negro group it would not be seated except in the basement, but the group refused to leave. The hostess called the police who, upon finding only a quiet group of people waiting to be served, refused to arrest anyone. Patrons in the restaurant who were not part of the sit-in became curious about it and stayed on, occupying seats, thus in effect helping the cause. After two hours in which business in the restaurant was almost at a standstill, the management decided to change its policy, and the hostess personally served the waiting Negroes.

Deciding that they had found a technique that worked, the sitters led in forming, in June, 1942, the Chicago Committee on Racial Equality to experiment further with nonviolent direct action. The following year the committee, with the help of the

Fellowship of Reconciliation, led in creating a national federation of groups devoted to nonviolent, direct action, called the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) which chose Farmer as its chairman. The major vehicle of the nonviolent movement of the 1940s had been created.

During most of the decade, CORE remained a loose federation of local groups, without a paid national staff. Its leaders were generally young, and among them were both colored and white. Aside from Farmer (a graduate of the School of Religion of Howard University, who later became program director of the NAACP, but who this year returned to CORE as national director), the leaders included George Houser, an ordained Methodist minister who later became executive secretary of the American Committee on Africa; and Bayard Rustin, who recently has been active in working with the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the War Resisters League.

In its early years, CORE's leaders—national and local—were generally pacifists, but this was not true of the rank and file. Some CORE leaders had been conscientious objectors during World War II. Officially, CORE was neutral on pacifism, but much of its nonviolent emphasis was nourished by the pacifists in its membership.

At first, CORE's national office was in a church in Chicago; from 1944 it shared offices with the Fellowship of Reconciliation in Cleveland; and from 1946 it shared the Fellowship's national office in New York. CORE's unpaid executive director, for most of the decade, was George Houser, whose paid occupation was that of a staff member of the Fellowship. There was some friction within CORE over whether the identification of CORE with the pacifist Fellowship scared nonpacifists away.

CORE was an interracial, urban movement, centered in the North, with only a few member groups south of the Mason-Dixon line at any time during the 1940's, and these all in the upper South—in Baltimore, Washington, St. Louis, and Bartlesville, Okla. (where, under pressure from "patriotic" societies, the leader of the CORE group was eventually forced from the library post which she had held for 35 years). The number of local groups affiliated with CORE was 10 in 1945, 13 in 1947, 15 in 1949, and 20 in 1950; and there was usually a number of cooperating nonaffiliated groups. Most of the affiliates tended to be unstable, flourishing briefly, dying down, then reforming. They were likely to be small, with perhaps 15 to 100 members, an exception being the affiliate in Columbus—the Vanguard League—which had 2,000 to 3,000 members.

Not all of the activities of CORE and CORE-related groups were carried out along strictly nonviolent, direct-action lines. Some activities followed conventional patterns, and in these CORE was often able to work with other organizations. CORE encouraged letterwriting campaigns to government officials or owners of businesses; petitions (as in Washington, D.C., to protest segregation in the public parks); and publicity by press releases. (In Denver, after a Negro was refused a room at a YMCA on Christmas Day with the explanation that there was no room available, a CORE press release drew a parallel with what happened a long time ago, at another inn at Christmas time.)

Some activities were less conventional, and in these it was harder to find cooperating organizations. When the "Freedom Train" was circulating the country to exhibit copies of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, CORE groups picketed it with signs saying, "There is no freedom till all are free."

CORE groups conducted opinion surveys to find out if department store patrons objected to being served by Negro sales-

clerks (in Cleveland, where department stores employed only white salesclerks, 68 percent of patrons were willing to be served by Negroes); listed restaurants, outside of Negro sections, which had no racial bars (in Washington, sitters could recall when there were only 4 such restaurants; by 1950, there were still only 17 they could list); printed cards for CORE friends to leave on the tables of desegregated restaurants expressing appreciation of their policy; solicited business for newly desegregated enterprises; bought stock in companies which practiced segregation—like the Greyhound bus company—and then appeared at stockholders' meetings to protest company policy; distributed leaflets at Pennsylvania Station in New York and the interstate bus terminal in Washington, informing passengers that in interstate travel, despite custom, the Supreme Court had ruled in the *Morgan* case in 1946 that segregation was unconstitutional; and promoted a song that urged interstate travelers to sit where they liked:

And if the driver-man says "Move,"
And if the driver-man says "Move,"
And if the driver-man says "Move,"
Speak up polite,
But sit there tight,
You're in the right,
You don't have to ride Jim Crow.

But it was in the more clearly nonviolent, direct-action projects that the CORE and CORE-related groups found their real metier. They adopted Gandhian methods imaginatively to the American scene, developing the techniques which sitters and freedom riders have made well known in the last few years.

Sitters in the 1940's, as now, found eating places their most convenient target. As early as 1944, the CORE group in Washington, D.C., decided that dime store lunch counters were excellent places to hold "sit-down strikes"—and for some of the same reasons that present-day sitters also find them so: "Because there is a good deal of Negro trade in these stores," they explained and "also because colored people are served at the present time standing up at the [lunch] counter." But they did not at that time discover that the dime stores were also a good choice because sympathy boycotts might spread against chain dime stores all over the Nation; that idea would not catch hold while the nonviolent movement remained small.

In the 1940's, CORE groups also held sit-ins at fancy restaurants, like the plush and hush restaurant in Los Angeles where a hundred persons at a time "sat-in." Sit-ins were held in a Negro-owned restaurant in Washington which discriminated against whites; at drugstore lunch counters and in department store restaurants.

In addition to eating places, there were also sit-ins in churches, as in Frankfort, Ky., and Bartlesville; in theaters, as in Yellow Springs, Ohio, and Baltimore; in swimming pools, as in Palisades Park, N.J., and Cleveland; in roller-skating rinks, as in Chicago; and in the religious services of prisons, as by the conscientious-objector inmates of the Federal prison in Ashland, Ky.

Other planned forms of nonviolent, direct action included stand-ins to buy tickets at discriminatory theaters, as in Washington, D.C., or at discriminatory swimming pools, as in Los Angeles, or to buy food at discriminatory cafeterias, as in Detroit; the picketing of segregated YMCAs, as in New York, and offices which promoted restrictive covenants for real estate, as in Chicago; small-scale boycotts, as of a tavern in Yellow Springs (it lost 60 percent of its business), or metropolitan-wide boycotts protesting discrimination against Negro employment, as of Carnation milk in San Francisco and Los Angeles, and of Wonder bread

in Chicago (both these actions were successful in changing company policy); testing for hotel discrimination in Boston; hunger or work strikes against segregated dining in prisons, as by conscientious-objector inmates of the Federal prisons at Lewisburg, Pa., and Danville, Conn.; sitting desegregated on buses and trains, as on a long "Journey of Reconciliation" through Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky and Tennessee in 1947, for which Rustin and three others were sentenced to 30 days in a North Carolina road gang on the charge of disobeying State segregation laws. (Among the riders on this trip was Jim Peck, one of CORE's recent freedom riders, who was severely beaten in Alabama last May). CORE tested the interracial use of parks which by custom had become segregated, as in Chicago; and set up new enterprises, such as unsegregated barber shops in Oberlin, Ohio, and State College, Pennsylvania, interracial cooperative houses in Chicago and Detroit, and an interracial cooperative store in Detroit.

All this activity by CORE and its friends naturally stimulated opposition. According to the demonstrators' reports, if they were served food at all, they sometimes were served ants in their pie, sour cream for their coffee, or garbage in their sandwiches; sometimes they were charged higher prices; sometimes employees tried to break the polluted dishes from which they had eaten. Occasionally, when demonstrators arrived, managers would close their businesses; or, especially if their businesses were swimming pools or roller-skating rinks, would pretend they were running a private club. Sometimes employees or onlookers kicked demonstrators, pushed them out of line in front of theater ticket windows, shoved them against glass windows in swimming pools till the windows broke, hounded them with ammonia fumes, had them arrested, beat them, played fire hoses on them—or, as the demonstrators went limp, dragged them away.

The members and friends of CORE were likely to differ about its primary function. According to some, this was simply to stop discrimination against Negroes by non-violent means. When such was the purpose, sitters sometimes occupied all seats in a restaurant or encouraged boycotts to force a change in policy. But according to others, forcing a change in policy was not justified: the function of CORE was rather to stop discrimination by changing the attitudes of the persons responsible for it. As Chaplain Howard Thurman of Howard University put it, the purpose of nonviolent direct action was "to tear men free from the alienment to the evil way, to free them so that they may be given an immediate sense of acute insecurity and out of the depths of their insecurity to be forced to see their kinship with the weak and insecure." When such was the purpose, sitters were likely to occupy only some of the seats in a restaurant, with the object of appealing to the conscience of customers and managers. In practice, however, as Houser admitted, CORE activities sometimes brought desegregation without changing managers' attitudes.

There was continuous study of CORE methods. The executive committee admitted in 1945 that CORE suffered from immature leadership, and pointed out that the lack of a paid national staff reflected inadequate organization. Houser stated that many who participated in direct-action projects simply didn't have time to carry through with all the patient steps required for effectiveness. After the executive secretary had led an unsuccessful direct-action project to desegregate a roller-skating rink in Cleveland, during which patrons had bullied the CORE group, Houser decided that "a really tough racial situation cannot be handled by the tactics which we have used to date."

CORE leaders also frankly faced the problem posed by the participation in CORE activities of certain "undesirables"—including neurotics, leftists who were using the movement for their own not necessarily non-violent ends, and those insufficiently disciplined to resist opportunity to retaliate with violence.

There was a barrage of criticism of CORE even from those who were foursquare for desegregation. Leftists blamed it for concentrating on racial injustice without recognizing that discrimination was merely part of an unjust social order. Activists said that CORE groups spent too much time investigating and negotiating, and too little in direct action. Purists complained that CORE sometimes succumbed to public prejudice by not permitting mixed colored-white couples to appear publicly on its behalf. Strategists condemned CORE for not doing much in the South, where the need was greatest.

Prof. Douglas Steere of Haverford College, a leading Quaker pacifist, answering a Fellowship of Reconciliation request that he sponsor a CORE project, wrote as follows:

"I have watched the CORE groups function in a number of cities, and there have been a number of these that I should certainly not be prepared to sponsor, for they were simply 'expressing themselves' and gaining experience at the expense of those they worked on, and the ultimate result did not really advance the cause, in my way of thinking. Other CORE groups, however, who went about the process of thoroughly acquainting the persons they meant to seek to influence with what they were about, and at every point continuing this education, have seemed to me extremely useful instruments in the present situation."

" * * * There is still a strong element of the John Woolman approach to the slaveholders in my way of seeing the solution to these problems, and unless that is wedded to the direct-action techniques, and unless those who undertake them are exceptionally well-disciplined and mature, I do not see this kind of program resulting in one which the fellowship can helpfully sponsor. On the other hand, I realize the necessity of some action which will give us opportunities to see whether the Gandhi technique can function in the West."

Nevertheless, CORE-sponsored action was often successful, and strong claims were made on CORE's behalf. Educator John Dewey wrote that the direct-action method "is education in action through solving life problems, and its value can hardly be overestimated." Labor leader A. Philip Randolph declared that CORE's adaptation of Gandhi's methods "has resulted in a novel and successful technique for removing discriminatory practices." Unitarian minister Homer Jack, of the Chicago Council Against Racial and Religious Discrimination, said of a CORE summer project in Chicago: "A small interracial group of young people fought on more fronts and got more accomplished than most of the professional high-salaried race relations experts in Chicago."

The current nonviolent movement bears many marks of its origin in the movement of the 1940's. Today, as 20 years ago, the motivation of many of the participants has a religious basis; now, as then, there is an attempt to slough off extreme leftist or neurotic hangers-on; now, as then, the techniques are much the same: sit-ins, stand-ins, picketing, boycotts, and freedom rides. There are, however, significant ways in which the two movements differ. In the earlier movement, most of the participants were young adults; now most are students. In the 1940's, the major action took place in the North, in a generally friendly climate, with the law often in its favor; today, though there is supporting action in the North, the major projects are undertaken in the South,

In a generally hostile climate and more often than not in defiance of State and local law. In the earlier movement, the action was strongly interracial; now it is more nearly dominated by Negroes. The earlier movement was on a small scale, featuring action by fairly cohesive, more or less disciplined groups, chiefly under the sponsorship of a national organization, CORE, with support from the Fellowship of Reconciliation; today it has become a mass movement, with action often spontaneous, beyond the control of any one organization. In the 1940's, the movement lacked general support by either whites or colored, or even by pacifists; today it has the support of many of the major forces of the Nation, thus bearing witness to a striking reversal of public opinion.

DISASTER

What will happen, you may ask,
In a State where states rights are of more
concern than human rights,
When the very last cell in the very last jail
Is full, and there is an SRO sign over the
door?
What will happen when the very last key
has turned in the very last lock,
And yet another busload of customers ar-
rives,
And there is word that still another is on
its way?
I can tell you what will happen:
The Governor will send an urgent message
to Washington,
Asking that his State be declared a disaster
area
And that Federal funds be sent immediately
To build more jails.—

RICHARD ARMOUR.

Envoy Warned United States and Got Squelched**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate during this debate on foreign aid to look back over the conduct of our foreign policy in the past to review our mistakes.

During the recent wave of anger generated by the hijacking of another American airliner, we may have forgotten that Castro's publicity-happy henchmen were hijacking airliners 3 years ago. At that time we ignored the warnings voiced by our American Ambassador in Cuba. While our State Department stalled and refused to recognize that Castro was behind the hijackings, more planes were stolen and one crashed killing six Americans.

Lest we forget, I wish to insert the following article by Robert Jones from the Indianapolis Star into the RECORD:

ENVY WARNED UNITED STATES AND GOT SQUELCHED

(By Robert Jones)

The one man who foresaw the continuing wave of aerial piracy was squelched almost 3 years ago by State Department order. He is Earl E. T. Smith, then U.S. Ambassador to Cuba.

Ambassador Smith fought for a strong U.S. stand when agents of Fidel Castro hijacked a Cuban airliner and crashed it, kill-

ing six American citizens. Smith warned then that U.S. prestige would suffer unless decisive action was taken. He also warned that American failure to respond would be an invitation to Castro, whom he described as publicity mad, to continue pirating planes.

The State Department's reaction was to smother the incident and smear Smith, a political appointee, in a flood of "leaks" to the press. Smith was accused of being a reactionary. It was even hinted that he had been paid off by Cuban President Batista. Castro shrilly echoed the charges.

If anything, however, Smith previously had demonstrated excessive restraint.

He had little to say in September 1958, when Castro was grabbing headlines by grabbing scores of U.S. citizens. In another publicity stunt Castro's guerrillas kidnaped 30 U.S. sailors and marines. A month later, Castro agents made off with three Americans when they hijacked an airliner en route to Santiago de Cuba.

A few days later, November 1, Smith exploded when Castro agents crashed a Vise-count airliner en route from Miami to Havana. He rushed a team of Embassy investigators to the scene.

All over the Caribbean attention focused on the case. U.S. reaction to the killing of its citizens would set a precedent. The outcome would decide whether American citizens can be killed or kidnaped without effective U.S. reprisals.

A SUPPLY BASE

One possible U.S. action was obvious Washington was permitting Florida to be used as privileged sanctuary and supply base for Castro's rebels. A flood of contraband arms and munitions was flowing semiopenly from the United States to Castro's Sierra Maestra. Energetic Federal action easily could sever this illegal supply line.

But the State Department chose to be perplexed. Days passed. Eventually it was announced that the State Department was still not sure that the hijacking was the work of Cuban rebels.

Even while Washington stalled, Castro agents hijacked still another airliner, also with Americans aboard. State Department Spokesman Lincoln White closed the crashed-plane case, however, with the bland claim that the State Department "had no further information on the identity of the persons who commanded the plane."

That was not true. Ambassador Smith and his aids easily had found conclusive proof that the 14 Cuban and American victims had been killed in a Castro conspiracy.

Smith's investigators had returned to Havana with rebel identification cards, armbands, Castro identification bracelets and similar paraphernalia stripped from the bodies of the two hijackers killed in the crash.

The hijackers were described as being in a state of frenzy. "This will be in all the newspapers of the world," they gibbered, capering up and down the aisle. Smith recognized the chilling future implications—planes could become targets for emotionally disturbed publicity seekers as well as political agents.

The Ambassador's report fixed the blame squarely on Fidel Castro. Realizing that his report to Washington would be buried, Smith also released his findings to the Havana press. This finished his diplomatic career. Smith was on his way out less than 2 months later. Oddly enough, several reporters for powerful New York and Chicago newspapers completely whitewashed Castro's role in the hijacking and bitterly assailed Ambassador Smith.

But more important was the fact that the State Department's response to piracy was an act of appeasement. All over the Caribbean it was recognized as such. Piracy had returned to the Caribbean.

Colonialism, Russian Style**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Soviet Union—highly proficient in propaganda—constantly barrages the world with "big gun bragging," on its accomplishments and its projective plans.

The great deficiency of U.S. policy is that too often it lets such bragging stand alone, uncorrected in the world mind.

Recently, for example, the Evening Telegram, of Superior, Wis., published a revealing editorial entitled "Colonialism, Russian Style."

The article reflects the way in which the Soviets—loud denouncers of colonialism—theirself represent the greatest colonial power of our times not only controlling, but milking dry the nations under their control.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLONIALISM, RUSSIAN STYLE

What is it really like to be a friend of the Soviet Union?

Everybody knows the answer being given by East German refugees who, in President Kennedy's words, are voting with their feet. But what of the tens of millions in other satellites without an escape hatch?

They live in some of the world's most crowded cities, yet new housing in Eastern Europe is hardly 40 percent of that in the Soviet Union, itself troubled by shortages.

It is estimated another 15 years will be needed just to complete rehabilitation of war-damaged buildings and transportation.

Subsistence levels in food and clothing are being met, but faulty distribution yearly wastes thousands of tons of food, and warehouses are jammed with industrial rejects and shoddy, unsalable fabrics and footwear.

The whole satellite area has fewer telephones than our city of Baltimore. Total annual satellite automobile output—much of it exported—doesn't match the Cadillacs we sell in a year.

Hungary, once a rich breadbasket for Europe, has had to become a grain-importing nation.

All these lands should be reasonably prosperous, for they have rich resources and talented, industrious people. Still, they lag far behind the West, and the Soviet Union, in factory and farm output.

The answer is simple. To be a compulsory friend of Russia is to be milked dry, year after year.

The milking began after World War II when Russia carted off nearly \$25 billion worth of capital equipment, even unto railroad tracks and telephone cables. It has continued ever since.

At first brashly but now more subtly the Kremlin has steadily overcharged satellite lands for its exports and underpaid them for its imports. In a 4-year span this thinly veiled theft was estimated at \$2.4 billion—enforced foreign aid for Moscow's benefit.

Russia controls all satellite strategic resources and through alleged joint companies manages whole sectors of their economies. Before the war, when Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania and the rest were free to chose,

they traded little with Moscow. Today more than half of Soviet trade is with these countries.

Furthermore, the Russians compel the satellites to bear the brunt of lavish low-interest trade credits to underdeveloped lands, and to aid Red-dominated Asian nations which in turn fatten Soviet coffers. The satellites rehabilitated war-torn North Korea.

Probably no colonial power in history has matched the squeeze the greedy Soviet Union has applied to its unhappy captive neighbors.

Less Waste, More Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been gratified by the fact that Secretary of Defense McNamara has been willing to make the necessary hard decisions which will bring about greater economy and efficiency in the Defense Department. On a number of occasions he has utilized his existing authority, particularly the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958. This authority permits him to study a given situation affecting common supplies and services and to decide how best to operate the function for the maximum benefit of the defense effort and the national economy. It is no secret that Secretary McNamara has initiated Project 100 in order to obtain the alternatives as to how best to operate the common supply functions in the Department of Defense. This is no small matter as it involves a stores inventory of \$42 billion, a worldwide inventory of \$120 billion and annual expenditures of \$22 to \$25 billion. A hard decision must be made soon.

An editorial from the Evening Star of August 17, 1961, entitled "Less Waste, More Weapons," gives significant praise to some of Secretary McNamara's recent efforts.

LESS WASTE, MORE WEAPONS

Defense Secretary McNamara surprised some Members of Congress by agreeing with the House that a 2-percent cut in Defense Department procurement appropriations was justified and could be absorbed by effecting certain economies. He had reference to the House Appropriations Committee's demands for elimination of overlapping and other wasteful practices in the purchase and distribution of military supplies. Mr. McNamara well merits the praise heaped on him at the Capitol for cracking down on inefficiency and waste of every kind at the Pentagon.

The 2-percent reduction made by the House was designed to force full compliance by military procurement officers with supply reforms recommended several years ago by the Hoover Commission. These called for consolidation of procurement activities by the three services and coordination of stockpiling and distribution systems. Steps in this direction have been taken by Defense officials, but much remains to be done.

When Secretary McNamara appeared before the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee he refused to accept the group's

suggestion that he ask for restoration of the 2-percent cut. Instead, he said: "In a large program there are always potential savings open to one. I think that in the circumstances we are in today, when we are asking for \$3 billion more, it makes even more important the saving of the 2 percent. We propose to live with it."

It has been a long time since a congressional committee has heard that kind of testimony from a victim of proposed economy. As a result the Senate applied the cut to the main appropriations, although exempting President Kennedy's emergency \$1.8 billion supplemental request. However, the House conferees (Representatives MAHON, SHEPPARD, CANNON, FORD, and TABER) stood firm and the bill finally passed with the 2-percent cut applied to the entire procurement appropriation. This means a potential saving for the taxpayers of about \$343 million—without impairing national defense in any way.

More than 20 years ago I was impressed by the sincerity and profundity of Buchman's followers. What they represented in the current history of ancient religious movements was the enthusiasm of the Essenes, of whom John the Baptist was one, who believed that one could change from wickedness to virtue by baptism, by washing away the sins. So Buchman answered man's willfulness by willing change. Not only was vice replaced by virtue, but futility by usefulness.

The young men and women who served in Moral Rearmament do not sit about and pray or sing hymns. They go out into the world to battle against social and political wrongs. Whereas the Salvation Army has battled against personal viciousness, such as drunkenness and poverty, Moral Rearmament moved toward the barricades where it fought communism as the evil of our day.

Buchman possessed no quality of bigotry. For him, there were many roads to God and each man had to choose his own. His movement had no priests or leaders; members united into groups of usefulness and spread themselves over the earth whenever they were most needed. They financed themselves as best they could and no great treasury was developed, but those who wanted to help did and those who wanted to give, gave. And the teams went forth to preach the doctrine of peace and human brotherhood.

I knew Frank Buchman well and admired him for his utter selflessness. What he had to give to humanity were his beliefs in the essential goodness and usefulness of man, and those who joined him were not abject followers but comrades in arms fighting for the better life.

Buchman was 83 when he died in a West German village. His movement assembled each year in Switzerland to discuss problems and then went to Mackinac in Michigan for other sessions. The great and the small came and many found in these assemblages the opportunity to open their hearts and expose their souls.

Is Moral Rearmament anarchic? The surprising characteristic of this movement is its orderliness. No one has ever been elected to be a president or a vice president, but somehow when a job had needed to be done, men and women fell into place, and the team functioned with extraordinary efficiency. Will it continue in this spirit and manner now that Frank Buchman is gone?

George E. Sokolsky Writes in Washington Post of Life and Death of Frank Buchman of Moral Re-Armament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, an editorial appearing in the Washington Post on Wednesday, August 16, 1961, by Columnist George E. Sokolsky.

Mr. Speaker, on August 10, 1961, I was pleased to make a few remarks on the floor of the House reporting the death of this world spiritual statesman, Frank Buchman, on August 7, 1961, in Europe. I am sure you, Mr. Speaker, and all the other Members of this great legislative body realize the potent force of spiritual values in the preservation of individual freedoms and the American way of life, join with me in stating our appreciation to Columnist George E. Sokolsky for his timely comments herein-after set forth:

FRANK BUCHMAN

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The death of Frank Buchman removed from the world a prophetic figure who adopted the idea that men change their personalities by free will. A clergyman, Frank Buchman, recognized that young people were not accepting orthodox forms of religion, even if they belonged to formal religious groups. He sought a method of solving personal problems by voluntarily changing one's personality, by personally accepting God's guidance in response to silence and prayer.

His movement started very small and I can recall when some of his followers came to my house in Sandisfield, sat on the grass under ancient maples to talk of life and personality. Frank, as he chose to be called, was then holding his house parties in Stockbridge, a suitable village for such a purpose, for it was in Stockbridge and the neighboring villages that the thought and art of America found its strongest expression during the 19th century.

H.R. 7057—Bill To Provide Tax Depletion Rate for Clay Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, depletion bill, H.R. 7057, will be considered by this body on Monday, August 21, 1961, under suspension of rules.

This bill will provide an equitable tax depletion rate for the clay products industry.

I have made many appearances in recent months in support of this measure. My activities in behalf of H.R. 7057 have also included numerous meetings with interested individuals of the clay industry and conference with many of my colleagues here in the House to enlist their support for this much-needed legislation.

There can be no question of the urgent need for passage of H.R. 7057. Without equitable treatment regarding depletion allowances, it is feared the clay products industry faces financial ruin.

The industry is composed of small, independent businesses, which compete with each other under highly competitive conditions and, therefore, it is traditionally an industry that operates with a very small margin of profit.

Consequently, any factor that creates for one of these businesses a substantial disadvantage in comparison with its competitors may well prove disastrous to that business.

These small industries are scattered throughout the United States, with 653 plants owned by 511 taxpayer companies, located in 49 of the 50 States.

In Indiana alone we have 82 of these small clay products plants, which can be found in almost each of our 92 Hoosier counties.

Approximately 6,500 persons are employed by the clay industry in Indiana, and these residents face the specter of unemployment if the Congress does not grant their industry an opportunity to meet competition of related industries which are enjoying Federal tax advantages granted by the Internal Revenue Service.

In the Sixth Congressional District, which I represent in the House, we have approximately 1,000 persons gainfully employed by the clay industry.

I would like to list for the record the clay industry firms of my congressional district, which will benefit from equitable taxation allowances under H.R. 7057:

Montgomery County—American Vitrified Products Co., Crawfordsville; Hydraulic Press Brick Co., Crawfordsville.

Fountain County—Hydraulic Press Brick Co., Veedersburg; Chicago Fire Brick Corp., Attica; Rostone Corp., Riverside; Poston Heron Brick Co., Attica.

Parke County—Dee-Clay Products Co., Bloomingdale; Clay City Pipe, Rockville.

Vermillion County—Architect Ceramic Corp.; Cayuga Brick Co.

Vigo County—Terre Haute Vitrified Brick Works.

Members of the clay industry in Indiana have reported to me in recent months that several plants have been forced to close their doors and lay off their workers due to taxation inequities that restrict their ability to compete.

I am also informed by officials of this industry that there is actual bankruptcy facing more of these backbone firms if the terms of the Internal Revenue Service rulings are carried out.

Instead of closing their doors and releasing their workers, these Indiana clay industry firms would prefer, and in some instances have, to improve and enlarge their plant facilities, distribute accumulated earnings in the form of dividends to shareholders, hire more employees and keep the selling prices of their products as low as possible in order to try to meet the competition of newly developed building materials.

For example, since 1951 the price of steel has increased by 66 percent, the price of cement by 45 percent, but the price of brick and tile has increased only 27 percent.

In the face of constantly rising costs, the miners of brick and tile clay have been able to keep their selling prices relatively low only because they were relying on the Government's assurance that they would receive a depletion allowance equal to 5 percent of the selling price of their burned brick and tile.

However, regardless of whether the brick and tile clay miners have reduced their surplus funds to a minimum because of expenditures for plant expansion, or because of distributions of surplus in the form of dividends, or merely because they charged less for their burned clay products than they otherwise would have done, the result is the same.

They have reduced their surplus funds to a minimum, and they have established no large contingent reserves for taxes because the Internal Revenue Service promised depletion deductions.

Now economic chaos in the industry and insolvency is threatened under the Internal Revenue Service's recent decision to disallow depletion deductions.

In addition to these hardships, the depletion disallowance for the brick and tile clay industry only smacks of discrimination and unfairness to one of the oldest and most reliable industries.

I am certain that the House Members recognize the jeopardy that faces the clay products industry and will vote prompt approval of H.R. 7057.

David Lawrence Offers Possibilities for Action Against Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the following column by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Evening Star. It may prompt some fruitful discussion of what we should be doing to answer the Communist challenge to freedom in Berlin.

ANSWERING THE REDS IN BERLIN—CLOSING OF ALLIED BORDERS IN CITY CALLED ONE OF SEVERAL POSSIBILITIES

IN EUROPE.—“We will use any ruse, dodges, tricks, cunning, unlawful methods, concealment, and veiling of the truth.”

The foregoing sentence is written in the Communist Party platform first proclaimed in 1919 by Lenin. This has never been withdrawn or revised. When Nikita Khrushchev recently restated the party platform and amended it in many particulars, he left standing the doctrine quoted above.

All Communist acts, therefore, must be judged by that blunt formula of deception, whether it be the violation in Berlin this week of the Four Power agreement signed in 1949 or of a disarmament “treaty” if one should be signed with the Soviets.

The Allies are building their hopes on a new agreement to be negotiated in the next few months to nail down their rights of access to West Berlin. But the Communist

Party doctrine indicates that the Soviets would not hesitate to disregard these pledges whenever they decide it is expedient to do so. Indeed, Premier Khrushchev told the British Ambassador only a few days ago, in discussing the existing Allied treaty rights in Berlin granted in 1945 and 1949, that these were “unreal and irrelevant.”

This is not surprising, coming as it does from a government that has no regard for morals or for the sanctity of a written pledge. But what are the Allies to do about it? Up to now, the procedure has been to make speeches, carry on conferences between foreign ministers and ambassadors of the West, and discuss privately a series of countermeasures—military, political, and economic.

While military preparations are important as a defensive precaution, neither side is likely to make a move in the direction of military action unless the other does—and it would have to be something more than a mere clash on a local basis to bring on anything so catastrophic as a nuclear war.

As for the political arena, this means an attempt through public statements and exchanges of notes to affect favorably the public opinion of the world, particularly in the so-called neutral countries where the Soviet Union has been making an intensive effort to win friends or to stir up trouble that would preoccupy Western forces.

What else can be done? The economic weapons of blockade now are being talked about openly. Chancellor Adenauer of West Germany has just said that trade agreements between the East and West would have to be reexamined. There are hints of a trade embargo. This naturally arouses anxiety in business circles, and already in London some authoritative British sources are saying that an economic embargo is not practical and would mean that Western exports would suffer.

But if bombs begin falling on millions of people, there will be suffering, too. Hence, the world has to choose now between preventing policies of a drastic nature or a drifting policy that gives to the enemy an impression of irresoluteness and defeatism.

Back in the days of the Truman administration there was a word used widely to describe the then-existing American policy toward the Soviet Union. It was “containment.” It meant that the Allies would draw a line around the Communist bloc and isolate it from the rest of the world. But the crisis never became sufficiently acute to make such a policy effective and gradually the proponents of exchange—whether in the educational, cultural, or commercial field—came to the fore.

The Soviets, however, have been getting the better of the bargain. They have been giving up little by way of information themselves through the exchange programs, but they have infiltrated nearly every large country and many of the smaller ones by increasing the staffs of their own embassies or legations—in many cases with several hundred persons—who enjoy diplomatic immunity. These diplomats are the clandestine link between the Kremlin and the small but influential group of agents and party members in the various countries who carry on the Moscow-directed intrigue, subversion, and espionage. They transmit the billions of rubles, converted into Western currencies, to finance the whole Communist apparatus.

The Soviet enterprises throughout the world would collapse if trade embargoes were applied and the whole system of converting Soviet money into other currencies were blocked off, so that the funds that flow to agents in Cuba or Mexico or South America or the Middle East or southeast Asia or Africa were in large part stopped.

There are plenty of countermeasures “short of war” which the West can take. The situation in Berlin affords a real oppor-

tunity. For, since the Soviets have ordered their puppet government in East Germany to seal off the borders, the allies could close their borders, too. A nonintercourse program could be gradually extended to apply to the other satellite countries. Certainly uprisings internally would occur in the Communist-dominated areas. But why should the West fear or timidly refrain from encouraging such outbreaks? Some failures will occur, but this is the price that has to be paid in the long struggle against Soviet tyranny.

Frustration Along the 49th Parallel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the people of Washington State, the Pacific Northwest, and the Nation have a great stake in the development of water resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries. Also vitally affected by such development are our neighbors, the people of British Columbia and the Dominion of Canada.

Without appearing critical toward our friends to the north, Mr. Speaker, I want to include in the RECORD an editorial concerning economic and political activity in British Columbia which may have widespread effect upon the implementation of the Columbia River Treaty and the joint development of United States-Canadian water resources. This editorial by Callison Marks was published August 6, 1961, in the Spokesman-Review, of Spokane, Wash.:

BRITISH COLUMBIA FRUSTRATES AMERICANS ALSO

There was a series of strange coincidences in Canada last week.

In Ottawa, frustrated leaders of the socialistic Canadian Commonwealth Federation, a political party, were combining with organized labor to form a new political party.

In Vancouver, funeral services were being held for a noted cultural leader and champion of free enterprise, A. E. Grauer, chief executive officer of the British Columbia Electric Co., one of the largest and most successful utilities on the continent.

In Victoria, British Columbia Premier W. A. C. Bennett, leader of the conservative-slanted Social Credit Party, announced to the provincial legislature that the government as of 2 p.m. Tuesday—had taken over the British Columbia Electric Co., something which the CCF socialists had been advocating for years.

In addition, Premier Bennett declared that the Peace River Power Development Co., a private-enterprise dam-promoting firm backed by famed Swedish industrialist Axel Wenner Gren, was also being expropriated.

The chairman of the Peace River company, Sir Andrew McTaggart, arrived from London with no inkling of the shocking news. He did learn that Bennett's British Columbia Energy Board had just determined that Peace River could be developed by the province at about the same rate as power from the proposed Canadian Columbia River projects.

Before the week was over, Bennett won legislative approval of his takeover plan. The Premier replaced the British Columbia

Electric's board of directors with men of his own choice, headed by Dr. Gordon Shrum, chairman of the British Columbia Energy Board and former dean of graduate studies of the University of British Columbia.

Bennett, the onetime Conservative politician, then had a \$100 million Provincial bond issue authorized for immediate payment for the shares of British Columbia Electric stock held by a parent corporation.

The total takeover price has been estimated at about \$700 million. The "contingent liabilities" of the Province now to about \$1.3 billion.

A little over a year ago Premier Bennett had told British Columbia voters that the Province was clear of public debt.

The Provincial takeover of the private power companies was justified, in part, by the Premier because the Canadian Federal Government handed back to Victoria only a small portion of the Federal taxes paid to Ottawa.

Provincial government operation of the British Columbia Electric deprives the Federal Government of the utility taxes. It also deprives many municipalities in the Province of the tax income formerly paid by the utility.

The total tax contribution of the company has been estimated at about \$17 million annually—to Federal, Provincial and local governments. Some municipalities near Vancouver are already worried over the loss of tax income from the company and are threatening to curtail school and other public services.

The frustrations in Canada over this power takeover now involve the validity of the Columbia River treaty, signed by the United States and Canada last January and ratified by our Senate in March. No attempt has been made by the Canadian Federal Government to get the treaty ratified by the House of Commons at Ottawa.

The Bennett government in British Columbia has now, in effect, told the Ottawa Government that it must authorize the export of power (to come from Columbia and Peace River Dams) or the treaty will be kaput. Victoria holds one type of veto power and Ottawa holds another.

The hydropower which the British Columbians hope to develop is too expensive for marketing in the Pacific Northwest, even though the price may be acceptable in lower British Columbia—or in California.

The present British Columbia power situation is a source of frustrations on this side of the border, where there has been faith that eventually the leaders in Ottawa and Victoria would settle their differences and the Columbia Treaty benefits would become a reality.

The frustrations here are now complicated over the purely American questions of power development on the middle Snake River, the possibility of commercial power from the new Hanford atomic reactor, and the prospect for construction of the proposed Bonneville-California intertie.

The Snake River problem is now in the hands of the Federal Power Commission. The Hanford problem is now in the hands of Congress. The intertie problem is now in the hands of the Department of the Interior.

The present Canadian situation also concerns the backers of Libby Dam in western Montana, the last great Federal project now in the planning stage. Construction will be stymied as long as Canada holds up ratification of the treaty.

Premier Bennett is a masterful politician who is looking out for British Columbia interests. He has taken a big gamble in the Provincial takeover of private power in his ambitious plans for public power development of both the Columbia and Peace River projects. He has caused some frustrations north of the border.

Now he has many power-minded Americans worried over what may happen here because of the Columbia River uncertainties and because of the quick but legally permissible snatching of Canada's largest investor-owned public utility.

Continuing A-Test Ban Held Suicidal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the President's announced intention to remain firm in Berlin, and to build up our ground forces as a deterrent to Soviet threats, I think it is appropriate for us to finally recognize the futility of the continuation of our voluntary nuclear test ban.

As the following article so ably points out, the President has implied that the latest top-secret information reveals that we cannot doubt that Russia has been testing nuclear weapons right along. Mr. Speaker, we can no longer afford the luxury of a one-sided ban. No one is fool enough to believe that we could win an all-out war without the use of fully developed nuclear weapons. Yet we continue this self-restriction and allow the Communists to continue to test on the sly. The time has come for decisive action. Too much valuable time has already been lost. Let us resume nuclear testing immediately.

The article follows:

(By Michael Padev, Star foreign editor)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy's statement on nuclear testing, made at his press conference yesterday, is highly disappointing.

Mr. Kennedy said, in effect, that he is prepared to continue the self-imposed American ban on nuclear testing, in spite of the fact that the Russians may well be testing secretly.

Here are Mr. Kennedy's exact words:

"I now have a report from the special panel on nuclear testing. This panel has examined a broad range of issues concerning our capabilities to detect and identify nuclear explosions. It has also gone into certain technical questions relating to nuclear weapons development."

"Although the report is made up of highly classified materials and cannot be released for that reason, I can say that as far as I am concerned this report has made me feel more urgently than ever that without an inspection system of the kind proposed by the United States and the United Kingdom at Geneva, no country in the world can ever be sure that a nation with a closed society is not conducting secret nuclear tests."

"In view of this report and in view of the deep longing of the people of the world for an effective end to nuclear testing, I am asking Ambassador Dean to return to Geneva on August 24, in an effort to ascertain whether the Soviet Union is now prepared to bring a safeguarded test ban agreement into being."

Stripped of the camouflage of diplomatic talk—and doublespeak—this Presidential statement reveals the following disturbing:

1. The special scientific and military panel on nuclear testing, appointed several weeks

ago by Mr. Kennedy, has now informed him that the United States has no way of knowing for sure whether or not the Russians are conducting secret tests.

2. This means that the United States has so far presumed—for nearly 3 years—that the Russians are not testing simply on the strength of Nikita Khrushchev's "word of honor" on the subject. For nearly 3 long years the United States has deprived itself of the possibility of perfecting its nuclear weapons, while the Communists—we can be sure of that—have been perfecting theirs.

3. In spite of this, Mr. Kennedy is prepared to go on with the nuclear test ban, presumably because of meaning of his reference to "world opinion." This is the "deep longing of the people of the world for an effective end to nuclear testing."

But who are "the people of the world" who supposedly long for the end of nuclear testing?

The American people are certainly not among them. The majority of Americans would never accept a nuclear test ban for the United States, while at the same time allowing the Communists to go on testing. Nor would any other free nation in the world—certainly not our allies—agree with such suicidal ideas.

The "people of the world" who supposedly "long" for the end of nuclear testing can be found mainly among the so-called neutralist states. And, of course, all Communist propagandists in the world have been shouting for years against nuclear testing—by the West. But they have never said a word against nuclear testing by Russia.

I should add here that U.S. military leaders want to resume underground nuclear tests. No dangerous fallout is involved here and no contamination of the atmosphere is possible. There are, in other words, no health hazards from such tests.

The idea of a voluntary American self-imposed nuclear test ban was first proposed seriously by Adlai Stevenson back in 1956 during the second Eisenhower-Stevenson Presidential campaign. The idea was not endorsed by the Democratic Party and, in any case, Stevenson was badly beaten at the election.

Former President Truman, who has a very shrewd knowledge of the Communist danger overseas, was against the idea, and only a few days ago he again told the press he would have never accepted the voluntary atom test ban.

President Eisenhower was originally against a one-sided (American) nuclear test ban as well. But under extreme pressure by some of his more "progressive" foreign policy advisers—and in spite of the strong opposition of all his military advisers—he agreed, toward the end of 1958, on the so-called 1 year moratorium plan.

Hopes were expressed that year the United States, Britain, and Russia would agree on a workable system of inspection. But the Communists did not ever think of discussing the problem seriously. They stalled all negotiations for 1 year, and then demanded another year for more talks. The West agreed.

At the beginning of the Kennedy administration, President Kennedy announced he would continue the ban with the hope of reaching an agreement with the Russians "within a reasonable time."

Seven months have passed since then. No agreement has been reached, and the Russians now don't want even to go on with the test ban talks. (They now want the matter referred to the United Nations)

It is indeed incredible to see how the Communists have been able to paralyze for nearly 3 years the production arm of the most important shield of American defense system.

It is also incredible that even now the U.S. Government is not able to see reason, to abandon the stupid farce of nuclear test negotiations with Moscow, and to resume underground nuclear testing for the protection of American national security.

Excerpts From Resolutions of the Third World Congress of the Communist International, Held in New York City in 1921

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have illustrated time and time again the vicious temper of the smear tactics being conducted against patriotic groups and individuals. The instigators of these vituperative attacks invariably attempt to justify their actions by stating that we cannot afford to let nationalism plunge us into war. But, we must face up to the fact that we cannot sit idly by while there are those who would destroy us from within.

The military leaders of this country have been severely criticized for their leadership in alerting our Armed Forces to the dangers of the international Communist conspiracy. The resulting furor over the gagging of the military has been far more harmful than any abuse of civilian control could ever be.

The Communist movement thrives on controversy and advocates the very result that has been achieved by a recent memorandum on the subject of military versus civilian control. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues and the citizens of this country excerpts taken from resolutions of the Third World Congress of the Communist International, held in New York City in 1921:

EXTRACTS PAGES 91 AND 92 OF THESES AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE THIRD WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL—1921 (PUBLISHED BY THE CONTEMPORARY PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION, NEW YORK CITY, 1921)

The methods of propaganda in the armies and navies of capitalist states must be adapted to the peculiar conditions in each country. Antimilitarist agitation of a pacifist nature is extremely detrimental, and only assists the bourgeois in its efforts to disarm the proletariat. The proletariat rejects on principle and combats with the utmost energy, every kind of military institution of the bourgeois state, and of the bourgeois class in general. Nevertheless, it utilizes these institutions (army, rifle clubs, citizen guard organizations, etc.) for the purpose of giving the workers military training for the revolutionary battles to come. Intensive agitation must therefore be directed not against the military training of the youth and workers, but against the militaristic regime, and the domination of the officers. Every possibility of providing the workers with weapons should most eagerly be taken advantages of.

The class antagonisms, revealing themselves as they do in the materially favored

positions of the officers as against the bad treatment and social insecurity of life of the common soldiers, must be made very clear to the soldiers. Besides, the agitation must bring home the fact to the rank-and-file that its future is inextricably bound up with the fate of the exploited classes. In a more advanced period of incipient revolutionary fermentation, agitation for the democratic election of all commanders by the privates and sailors and for the formation of soldiers' councils may prove very advantageous in undermining the foundations of capitalist rule.

The closest attention and the greatest care are always required when agitating against the picked troops used by the bourgeoisie in the class war, and especially against its armed volunteer bands.

Wherever the social composition and corrupt conduct of these troops and bands make it possible, every favorable moment for agitation should be made use of for creating disruption. Wherever it possesses a distinct bourgeois class character, as for example, in the officers corps, it must be unmasked before the entire population, and made so despicable and repulsive, that they will be disrupted from within by virtue of their very isolation.

A New Creativity Flexes Its Muscle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I hope it will be possible for many of my colleagues to read the August issue of Television. I understand each Member has been furnished a copy. However, if for any reason any Member did not get a copy and will call my office I will see that he gets one.

Much has been written with reference to television in this last year. It has been pictured by some as a vast wasteland, by others as the chief villain in juvenile delinquency, and by others as for minds only in the lower intelligence quotients.

Unfortunately, very few people know all that is contained in the scope of television within the United States. Television magazine for August 1961 has printed a series of articles with pictures showing not only the scope but also the depth of television and its impact on the social and cultural life, not only through the networks but also through the programming in local communities, which are conceived "to serve a particular audience—an audience of many parts, many tastes, many desires, and many needs."

I am attaching herewith the introduction: "A New Creativity Flexes Its Muscle." This is followed by a series of eight articles which show what is being done in eight separate areas of programming. I am sorry that the rules of the House will not allow me to insert these articles in the series. I do, however, urge all of my colleagues to make a special effort to read them in order to see the full depth and scope of the creativity of television in its broadest sense:

**MIDYEAR ANALYSIS OF LOCAL PROGRAMMING:
A NEW CREATIVITY FLEXES ITS MUSCLE**
(By Richard K. Doan)

Like a fireman inured to heat, the U.S. telecaster has learned to take browbeating in stride. Nevertheless, at this juncture in his relatively brief career, he is obviously mindful of the recent public and official outcries over TV fare.

Local television in the United States, the product of over 500 commercial stations, is about to undergo some facelifting. It won't be so drastic as to produce a new look. But it should be more in line with the wishes of TV's critics, most apparent in a concerted trend to more news, public affairs, and educational programming.

Along with the networks, many a station management is taking stock. It is highly evident, on the basis of a questionnaire survey conducted by Television magazine this summer, that there will be a measurable increase in the coming months in local TV news, public affairs, live entertainment, and educational programming.

Significantly, any major overhauling in prospect will come more from the bottom than from the top. That is, those stations which have been making a substantial local effort right along are planning no decided step-up, while those which have been prone to take the film-network route begin to see the propriety, if not indeed license salvation, in more community interest.

The reason these innovations probably will not produce a decidedly new look is inherent: So much of TV's entertainment comes down the line from the networks that it's difficult for the individual station to make a strong dent in the public's overall impression—except as stations collectively might influence network taste in programming.

In his own bailiwick, the telecaster can make a choice between reliance on film product, which tends to bring him tempting profits, or local live productions, which are a lot more expensive but look good on his community and FCC records. Most stations quite naturally strike for some sort of balance between the two. One trouble is that the best local efforts, in themselves often highly creditable, bulk so small in the local TV panorama that they are lost to critical and general view.

Grassroots television at this instant presents no particular composite picture. It tends, among the network affiliates who constitute its overwhelming majority, to follow a popular pattern, but a breakdown of its programming elements discloses a diversity of approaches almost as numerous as the stations.

Of approximately 175 replying to this magazine's questionnaire—and representing a cross section of large and small markets across the country—some were far different from others:

In the surveyed week, May 7-13 (the week, incidentally, in which FCC Chairman Newton Minow made his now celebrated vast-wasteland speech), one station was on the air only 59 hours, another 142:26 hours.

One Texas ABC affiliate took only 30 hours of network programming; a three-network affiliate in the same State carried 108:50 hours of line-fed shows (some, presumably, on a delayed basis).

A few stations booked as few as 2 hours of syndicated film. Others carried up to 45 hours.

Three stations aired no movies at all (one of these said it would be starting them soon), while a west coast independent logged 98 of its 122 hours with feature films.

Four stations originated no more than 5 hours each of local live programming during the week. Four others offered more than 30 hours each, one of them 41 hours.

Five stations programmed not more than 1 hour of local news each in the entire week,

but nine others turned out more than 7 hours apiece.

Twenty-two stations had no children's programs whatever, whereas twenty-five reported 10 hours or more each of moppet fare, the most prolific a Nebraska station which devoted 34:30 hours to the kiddies.

Seventy-nine stations bypassed women's service entirely.

Sixty-four scheduled no variety-panel-music shows.

One hundred and thirty-nine eschewed audience participation formats of any kind.

Forty-three were without religious programming, and thirty-three offered no educational-cultural entries.

In all of these program categories, there were other stations which gave them substantial segments of time. A Virginia station, for example, ran 8 hours of religious shows. A California station went for 17:30 hours of audience participation. A New York station could claim 23:45 hours of educational-cultural programming.

Considerable disparity also turned up in local broadcasters' approaches to specials. Entertainment one-shots were distinctly not their dish in many cases. During the season from September 1, 1960, to June 1, 1961, 70 of the reporting stations undertook no such projects. On the other hand, many stations chanced a few, six programmed over 20 hours each of such specials, and six others ran up over 30 hours each. One major independent in California claimed 129 hours of entertainment specials.

When it came to public-affairs specials, the spread was far more impressive. Only 16 stations reported they carried none at all. On the top side, 14 put together 30 hours or more each. A Florida station claimed 104 hours, a Maryland station 75 hours.

Editorializing is in a steep climb. About 45 percent of the reporting stations said they air editorials, although well over half of these are scheduled only on an occasional basis. Twenty-eight of the stations said they had started editorializing within the past year.

The trend of station thinking on programming for the immediate future was evident in responses to a question about planned changes in local shows for fall.

About half of the stations indicated either that they contemplated none or that it was too early to say. Several, playing it close to the vest, said they couldn't disclose their plans.

The other half implied by their answers that they were sensitive to the mood of recent TV onslaughts. In case after case, they expressed their intentions in phrases such as these:

"More public service, more news, more specials." "More live programming of all types." "Educational films, more children's time, more news." "Increased local public affairs specials." "Prime-time public affairs programming." "More local variety and public affairs; greater emphasis on live programming."

A number of stations stressed plans to schedule public affairs programs regularly in prime time. Mostly, these would be monthly preemptions of network periods.

Dozens of specific shows were listed as planned: a drama workshop, a weekly "focus on jazz," a weekly "great book analysis," a ranch party and square dance, a 30-minute news review, a capitol news conference, a teenage panel and talent show, several educational series in cooperation with universities, a "local musicians" program, several agricultural series, typing instructions, a Spanish language course, musical variety.

The emphasis of the hour was to be found in a tabulation of mentions of the types of programs in work: public affairs and information, 43 mentions; educational, 28; news, 17; live adult entertainment, 15; children's

programs, 9; women's shows, 6; farm shows, 6; editorializing, 5; cultural shows, 5; syndicated series and sports, 3 each; special events, movies, exercise shows, and religion, 1 each.

Granted that these indicated plans are straws in the wind, the question of where grassroots TV goes from here is still difficult to answer.

Undeniably, the TV stations are prosperous. A major New York station representative disclosed in passing the other day that one of his stations, a moderate-size Middle Atlantic outlet, is realizing a 55 percent net before taxes.

A station-group executive noted last month: "Now's the time for creative people to get in their licks. The moment is ripe for those with programming ideas to put them forward. The management mood perhaps never was more receptive."

A station manager said he might put more quality programming on the air if his program people would come to him with strongly felt ideas—and sell me on them.

One of the paradoxes of the business is that broadcasters reap so little public and official recognition for the efforts they do make in the public interest. As one major executive put it recently: "I think one trouble is that the broadcasters haven't sold what they've done in public affairs." He didn't suggest how they might do it.

A widespread feeling among thoughtful observers is that stations aren't under fire so much for what they don't do in the realm of information and culture as they are for entertainment programming which offends tastes and sensibilities.

Most broadcasters can build an impressive documentation of what their stations have done in the community interest. The TV stations of the United States could literally inundate FCC Chairman Minow's office with evidence: brochures, presentations, photographs, trade ads, commendations and awards, and mountains of mail.

SNOWED UNDER IN AN AVALANCHE OF STEREOTYPES

The hitch seemingly is that much of the stations' do-good efforts escapes general notice. If it isn't half-lost by exposure in light viewing hours (i.e., Sunday afternoon or late night)—which, to be sure, is of the broadcaster's doing—it is lost in impressiveness because it occupies such a fractional part of the whole program spectrum. In short, a few public affairs specials, wonderful as they may be to critical audiences, are snowed under in the public mind by the avalanche of stereotyped offerings.

There have been recent efforts here and there both to counteract public disparagement and to invite community understanding of broadcasting's problems.

On June 27, the three stations of the Albany-Schenectady-Troy (N.Y.) area, WRGB, WTEN, and WAST, preempted 30 minutes of prime time for a simulcast titled "Status—Television Northeast" to tell how the stations have tried to meet their local obligations.

In Philadelphia, WCAU-TV is inviting community leaders to sit down before the cameras with General Manager John Schneider every third Sunday afternoon for a 30-minute exchange of ideas and comments on TV programming.

In New York, a leading station rep, Blair-TV, has mounted a project to encourage stations to package more local factual programming and to sell the values and virtues of such programming on Madison Avenue (see "New Way To Sell in a Buyer's Market," p. 109).

The situation confronting the stations has typically, two sides: one says the industry is running out of film product and the stations must perform turn to live productions; the other side says plenty of canned

stuff is around, and coming up, and what's all the crying about?

One says the squeeze is on for upgrading programing and that broadcasters cannot resist reform. The other says the shouting will pass, as it has before, and nothing drastic is called for.

The film's all-gone school of thought frequently states that only one (or not even one) new first-run syndicated package is available for fall. Actually, at least half a dozen new series are on the market.

The don't-get-excited school says that even if film is in shorter supply now, demand will create new product.

The syndicators themselves blame the stations for the current dearth on grounds that broadcasters have driven prices down to the point where studios can't afford continued production of quality features.

"It's no wonder the situation is worse today than ever," the president of a major syndicating operation observed. "While production costs have soared, the stations have gone on paying the same rates for film that they did 5 years ago."

Large chunks of station time are still plugged with syndicated product. The average among stations responding to Television magazine's survey was between 15 and 20 hours weekly, but some ran to as much as 38 and 45 hours. WPIX New York, probably the heaviest user, has had 56 half-hour film features (including network reruns) in its weekly 7-11 p.m. time.

There is a particular concern about the network reruns, how worth buying will many of these be, the question goes, if the action-adventure cycle suddenly runs its course? Westerns already are over the hill, except for a handful of the best ones.

Another question: How well will the plethora of hour-long network entries fit into local schedules as reruns? Some quarters doubt their market will be good.

Movies are viewed as a continuing bulwark of profitable local TV. Few stations have yet abandoned their "late shows" in favor of attempting to buck NBC's durable Jack Paar with live local efforts, although several have decided to try it with the Westinghouse stations' new taped "PM East" and "PM West."

The average station, judged by those surveyed, still books close to 20 hours a week of feature films. Nineteen reported they programmed less than 5 hours weekly, but another 11 aired more than 32 hours each.

While there has been evidence that TV movies pull less well than they once did, New York's WOR-TV amply demonstrated this summer that topgrade films still magnetize audiences. Ranked as the most film-happy operation of all (76 out of 81 hours in one June week), the RKO-General independent kicked off a big preview series of Seven Arts films with a June 20 showing of "The High and the Mighty." Running from 9 to 11:15 p.m., the show picked off a 24.2 Arbitron and topped all competition including Gary Moore.

A new film tack is underway at New York's Daily News independent. WPIX's general manager, Fred M. Thrower, believes that half-hour formula westerns and private-eyes have pretty well "had it." He has booked only three prime-time westerns for fall, adding "Wanted—Dead or Alive," and one of these may be dropped. Meantime, WPIX will gamble on building a trend for real-life adventure with nine prime-time half hours of this fare: "I Search for Adventure," "Bold Journey," "Wild Cargo," John Gunther's "High Road," "Seven League Boots," John Cameron Swayze's "It's a Wonderful World," "Adventure Theater," "Rendezvous With Adventure," and "Global Zobel." Some of these have been filmed especially for TV; others are compiled of film shot by explorers, adventure clubs, and others.

A GROWING NEW SOURCE OF FILM

Still another source of film programming has been noticeably growing in recent months: the stations themselves. Most of the product is of a nonfiction category, such as the "PM" series, Metropolitan Broadcasting's "Albert Burke," and "John Crosby Show," WNBC-TV New York's "Dr. Joyce Brothers" (through ABC films), WPIX's "Secret Life of Adolf Hitler," and other documentaries, WNTA-TV New York's "Play of the Week" and "Open End." The list grows steadily.

Recently, still more impetus to this trend came in the formation of a Trans-Lux subsidiary, Television Affiliates Corp. Backed by an advisory committee of prominent station executives, the firm is assembling a library of 100 odd station-produced programs of a cultural and informational nature to offer to other stations. This fall, TAC will attempt to sign up 100 or more stations as subscribers.

Straight program exchanges are underway, too, such as the international one set up by CBS's owned and operated outlets in which New York's WCBS-TV "American Musical Theater" has been swapped abroad for 12 hours of foreign programs for use as an international hour on the five o-and-o's. Similarly, the Westinghouse stations have cooperated with the National Educational Television & Radio Center to show and distribute documentaries on world affairs produced by International Television Federation.

In live programing, news and other informational shows undoubtedly received the most impetus in recent months. Some stations expanded their early evening "report" (including a quarter-hour from the network) into a full hour, with notable results. Last September KFSD-TV, San Diego, took this tack and doubled its 6-7 p.m. ratings. The bigger news package appeared to heighten audience interest: sets in use, from May 1960 to May 1961, jumped from 33 to 53.

In March WAGA-TV Atlanta went to a full hour "Panorama" of news at 6 p.m., including its "Waga Editorial" in a flexible format allowing for instant updating of patches breaking during the period.

In San Francisco, KRON-TV's 30-minute "Assignment Four" at 6:30 p.m., now in its second year, has picked up awards for its regular news-in-depth efforts. In another example of news alertness, KRON-TV aired President Kennedy's April 20 speech on the Cuban crisis three times that day, repeating it twice at 7 p.m. with a suggestion to viewers between the replays that they alert friends and neighbors to the rebroadcast.

When Hurricane Donna blew in, WTVJ Miami stayed on the air around the clock to report its progress. Films of Donna by WCKT Miami became part of a U.S. Weather Bureau special report on hurricanes.

Last fall WTVJ began programing a daily news show in Spanish, News en Espanol, for the benefit of 50,000 Cuban refugees in the Miami area.

Not all of the extended regular news coverage is in the customary evening slot. WBZ-TV Boston gives its News at Nine (a.m.) a half hour, injecting feature interviews. Incidentally, WBZ-TV's Starring the Editors, a news analysis moderated by Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor, is in its 11th year.

Some news specials have inspired official action. A WOW-TV Omaha "TV News Conference" on the increase in crime in the Omaha area brought about passage of a crime-study resolution by the Nebraska Legislature.

Among the stations responding to Television magazine's questionnaire, by far the most give news from 2 to 4 hours weekly on a regular basis. About one-fifth of them, however, exceeded 5 hours weekly, with some reaching past 8 hours.

In children's programing, the cartoon and comedy strip-with-live-master of ceremonies formula has become so solidly entrenched and widespread that almost no other kind of kiddie show exists. Loaded with cans of "Laurel & Hardy," "The Three Stooges" and the like—and now "Dick Tracy"—the stations present the strips in bits and pieces spliced with smalltalk from studio clowns, cops, cowboys, and cuties (WISN-TV Milwaukee has a pair of girl puppeteers) to entertain peanut galleries of knee-high fans.

The formula generally works. In fact, where it works well, competing stations often just give up and shoot for whatever adults they can round up. More than 25 percent of the stations surveyed in June reported either no children's programing or less than 2 hours weekly.

On the other hand, a few go hot and heavy for the children, giving them 20 hours a week or more of juvenile fare. In the seven-station New York market, WPIX has corralled the kids with 3 hours daily (4-7 p.m.) of strip upon strip, hosted by a platoon of funnymen. It has been charged by competitors that WPIX has a sort of unfair advantage: with its daytime largely occupied by Regents-sponsored classroom TV, "If WPIX doesn't catch them in school, it gets them when they come home."

Some added interest in kiddie shows on the part of stations is foreseen in the wake of word out of Washington that the FCC plans to add this category of programing to the breakdown requested in license renewal forms.

As for live local daytime programing for the housewife, it is possibly less plentiful than formerly, but persists in many localities in many formats. Judging from questionnaire findings, well over a third of the stations carry no "women's service" shows and also as many air no variety-panel-music programs. Audience-participation shows are still fewer; fully two-thirds of the stations bypass them.

Religious programing occupies something less than 2 hours weekly on about 50 percent of the stations surveyed. Of the remainder, about half carry no religious shows at all.

Even Administration Spokesmen Admit From Time to Time That We Cannot Buy Loyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to learn, from the report of a speech he made before the National Press Club, that Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles has finally come to the conclusion that the United States cannot buy friendship and loyalty. The New York Times account of Mr. Bowles' speech, which I include herein as a part of my remarks, makes most interesting reading in the light of some of the past statements of the gentleman, and in the impassioned pleas we have heard in the past few days from administration supporters for the need to increase foreign aid spending and to give the President even greater power to give away taxpayers' money. For years I have taken the floor of the House, when the mutual se-

curity bill has been before us, to point out that pouring money into foreign lands is not the answer to communism. The United States will maintain a position of leadership in the world and will command the respect and loyalty of other peoples only to the extent that we stand on principle, the principle that we are for freedom and the right of all men to choose their own system of government. When we demonstrate that we will support, with action as well as words, the right of self-determination for all nations, those who support the same principle will be with us regardless of whether they receive monetary aid or not. Those who are dedicated to the Communist philosophy will never be on our side, no matter how much we pay them. I am glad Mr. Bowles has learned this from his travels.

The New York Times account of Mr. Bowles' speech follows:

BOWLES FINDS UNITED STATES DOUBTED ABROAD—REPORTS SKEPTICISM IN NEW NATIONS ON ADHERENCE TO TRADITIONS OF FREEDOM

WASHINGTON, August 15.—Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles said today that he had found underdeveloped nations profoundly skeptical of the U.S. capacity to live up to its own revolutionary traditions.

Reporting at a National Press Club luncheon on his 20-day tour of Africa, Asia, and Europe, Mr. Bowles declared that "the enormous truth that comes home from this trip is that we can no longer coast on our revolutionary past."

"We may still sell an antique chair by boasting that Tom Paine once sat in it," Mr. Bowles said, "but we cannot persuade skeptical Asians, Africans, and Latin Americans that we believe in the rights for which Paine spoke so fervently unless our actions fit our words."

TRADITION NO LONGER SUFFICES

The Kennedy administration has taken the position that the revolutionary heritage of the United States has equipped it to provide leadership in the revolutionary world of the 1960's.

Mr. Bowles devoted a large part of his talk today to insist that the Jeffersonian traditions no longer suffice at a time when "we Americans will be tested in the next few months as perhaps never before in our long history."

"Let us recognize bluntly that right now most Asians, Africans, and Latin Americans are profoundly skeptical of our capacity consistently to live up to our revolutionary tradition in support of self-determination and equality for all peoples," he said.

"Throughout the non-Communist world the tide of history is now running with flood force: for self-government, for economic justice, for racial equality," Mr. Bowles said. "These are the principles which we must support, morally, because they rest at the foundation of our own society and, realistically, because they represent the crucial force which is now shaping the institutions of our time."

BERLIN CRISIS DISCUSSED

Mr. Bowles told his audience that the Berlin crisis had loomed high in his talks with President Tito of Yugoslavia, the leaders of the world's unaligned nations, including Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India and Premier Nu of Burma.

In all his meetings his trip, Mr. Bowles said, he had drummed home the fact that the flight of refugees from East Germany to the West was "a fantastic and extraordinary defeat for communism" and Premier Khrushchev.

"For several years now Mr. Khrushchev had been proposing what he describes as competitive coexistence between the Communist and non-Communist nations in the world," he said.

"So here in the very heart of Europe we have had the competition for which Khrushchev has been pleading and the results are clear: communism had failed," Mr. Bowles said. "It is also clear that Mr. Khrushchev is a poor loser."

Mr. Bowles said he had found "that when we speak of America's legal right to remain in Berlin few Asians and Africans are impressed. Nobody wants a nuclear war ***," the United States legal rights."

FACES LIGHT UP

However, he said, "when we stress our role as defenders of the right of the West Berliners to make their own decisions, then faces light up and heads nod. For Asians and Africans know that self-determination is basic to their own independence."

In replying to questions following his speech, Mr. Bowles advocated what he called giving freedom of choice to uncommitted nations, instead of "nervously biting our fingernails" when leaders such as President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana or President Sékou Touré of Guinea visit Moscow.

Mr. Bowles also seemed unconcerned about continuing reports that President Kennedy was about to shift him to a new job in the administration. These reports have cited alleged dissatisfaction with Mr. Bowles' activities in the State Department, including his stream of policy ideas that sometimes are put forth without White House clearance.

Beaming, he told the overflow audience that the "reports of my death have been greatly exaggerated." He announced that he had just purchased a new house—"in Washington."

Then Mr. Bowles proceeded with the exposition of his ideas on what the U.S. policy should be in the underdeveloped world.

"We could," he said, "buy United Nations votes with aid. We could think that if people are full of rice they will support the status quo, but, then, we shall only have more muscular Communists."

The Delaware State News Compliments the President and Supports Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR. OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. McDowell. Mr. Speaker, our country grew to its present eminence in part as the result of the kind of independent and sturdy folk who edited and published our weekly newspapers.

Today, in our mass society these hardy souls must sometimes feel that our people are influenced only by the great television networks and the metropolitan newspapers and magazines of our greatest cities.

But, then, Members of the House themselves sometimes feel that the networks and the metropolitan newspapers and magazines are inclined to give undue weight to the Senate and its Members.

Today, I would like to call attention to an editorial and a letter published by

Jack Smyth, editor and publisher of the Delaware State News.

It reflects the kind of keen mind without which any society, not ours alone, is almost powerless:

[From the Delaware State News, Aug. 14, 1961]

DEAR MISTER PRESIDENT

Along with other Americans I have been watching closely the actions of our new President. John F. Kennedy has given us some anxious moments—but I am greatly encouraged by the way he is now handling his very difficult task.

I am a firm believer in telling a person what I think. When any public official is doing a good job—it is only right to tell him so. And when he isn't—tell him that too. It is really the obligation of a citizen.

For these reasons I wrote this open letter to the President of the United States on Friday:

AUGUST 11, 1961.

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: During the few months you have been in office I have, along with millions of your fellow Americans, have been observing the way you have been handling your many problems and tremendous responsibilities. I think you are doing a wonderful job. Keep it up and I feel confident you will go down in history as one of the greatest Presidents.

Strangely enough, I formed this impression at the time of the Cuban invasion. Your courage in taking full responsibility, when you had just taken bad advice, proved to me that you are truly a man worthy of the high office you hold.

The stand you have taken on Berlin has been nothing less than magnificent. I am convinced that you have this Nation fully behind you—as well as our allies. And that you have Mr. K. bluffed—for a change.

I feel impelled, as the editor of a small daily newspaper, to write this letter supporting your foreign policy. (There are some aspects of your domestic program that I cannot agree with.) But I do want you to know I feel you are doing an outstanding job. Keep it up.

Sincerely,

JACK SMYTH,
Editor and Publisher.

Hitting the Nail on the Head

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, one of my predecessors in this House, who now represents our State of Maryland in the Senate of the United States, the Honorable J. GLENN BEALL, has made some very timely remarks on a subject which is of concern to every Member of this House. The constitutional division of governmental power between the State and local governments on the one hand and the Federal Government on the other is a fundamental element of our political structure which is subjected to great pressures by the rapidly changing times in which we live. But the swift tide of national and world events is not

the only moving force behind the changes in the Federal nature of this country. I believe that a recent statement of the distinguished Senator from Maryland and the subsequent comment of the Catoctin Enterprise, a newspaper of Thurmont, Md., in the Sixth Congressional District, will shed a great deal of light on the decision which must be made regarding this problem.

Senator BEALL said:

SOCIALISM OR AMERICANISM?—WE MUST CHOOSE

When we demand Federal aid for virtually everything, we are refusing to take care of things which are our personal or local responsibility and are aiding the cause of socialism. We shall be moving for strength of character and constructive initiative, and away from creeping socialism, when we stop requesting nonessential new programs and Federal expenditures, when we revitalize our State and local governments, and when we assert the fundamental freedoms and independence which are our heritage.

The editorial inspired by this statement comments:

(From the Catoctin Enterprise, Aug. 11, 1961)

HITTING THE NAIL ON THE HEAD

The final paragraph of Senator BEALL's "Senate Cloakroom" Letter, which appears on another page this week, is of such vital import that every citizen and taxpayer should read it. Not that the Senator's entire letter is uninteresting. Indeed far from it. But this last paragraph, headed "Socialism or Americanism? We Must Choose.", is of immense concern just now when the public is beginning to look to the Federal Government for help in almost every conceivable phase of local governmental operation.

Senator BEALL writes that "when we demand 'Federal aid' for virtually everything, we are refusing to take care of things which are our personal responsibility and are aiding the cause of socialism." There can be little doubt that he is right. Yet the difficulty seems to be in convincing the general taxpaying public that it is worth making sacrifices locally in order to avoid the socialist trend. Federal aid to education is one example. We have stated repeatedly that we are opposed to Federal aid to education, but that we believe it to be inevitable. We believe it to be inevitable because experience in the educational field has convinced us that the people simply will not pay the taxes locally which are necessary in order to provide the types of schools and the brand of education necessary to the present age. They would rather have the Federal Government extract from them even more taxes than are necessary for this purpose, and return only a portion of the money, than pay out the necessary funds voluntarily themselves.

In other words, although they would perhaps not admit it, they would rather have a moderate form of socialism and be robbed blind by the Federal Government than step up boldly with their eyes open, and pay down what is necessary to secure the services they need. They will pay for these services, but only if they are forced to do so. What a sad commentary on the intelligence and good judgment of the American public.

Of course, all these funds cannot come from real estate taxes, and perhaps that is one of the underlying reasons for local feeling in this regard. If the counties and the State were permitted more tax powers by the Federal Government, then perhaps people would be more willing to raise whatever funds they need by means of these taxes. But it is doubtful that such permission will

be granted easily by Washington, for Uncle Sam needs money too, and retaining a portion of each dollar that reaches him before he bestows his benefactions upon local governmental communities enables him to keep his own Treasury solvent.

provided rural and smalltown residents in a large section of Illinois with high-quality programming and public services—much of it locally produced. We feel that any change in the status of WDIA could only result in a loss of service and quality of programming to many of our farmer-members.

To reduce the ability of this station to reach these rural and smalltown residents, many of whom are far from large television market centers, could only decrease the amount of television programming available to them. In addition, we feel that the division of WCIA's coverage area among a number of smaller stations would be simply replacing an able and established broadcast facility with smaller outlets incapable of supporting the staff and equipment necessary to produce the valuable local programming to which the viewers in this area have become accustomed.

We seriously urge the Commission to consider carefully the number of rural viewers who would suffer a quantitative and qualitative loss of television service as a result of the deintermixture plans. We hope you will bring these considerations to the attention of the Commission.

WILLIAM J. KUHFUSS,
President,
Illinois Agricultural Association.

CITY OF SHELBYVILLE,
Shelbyville, Ill., August 9, 1961.
Hon. PETER F. MACK, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the people of Shelbyville and the surrounding territory, I am asking your consideration and assistance in any way possible to avert the proposed change of WCIA channel 3 TV, near Champaign, Ill., to UHF frequency.

A change of this type would be a great loss to all television viewers in this area as we would be completely void of CBS reception.

Any assistance you can give us in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,
WILLIAM E. LECRONE,
Mayor.

Special Centennial Prayer and Thanksgiving Day in Kansas and at Washington National Cathedral

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the eloquent proclamation of Gov. John Anderson, Jr., of Kansas, establishing this next Sunday, August 20, 1961, as Special Centennial Prayer and Thanksgiving Day in Kansas. This is in connection with Kansas Day services to be held this Sunday at our National Cathedral here in Washington:

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, STATE OF KANSAS, TOPEKA, KANS.

To the People of Kansas, Greetings:
Whereas Kansans should be ever mindful of their religious heritage stemming from the labors of the founders of the State who were men and women devoted to the establishment and perpetuation of Christian ethics and spiritual discipline; and

BLOOMINGTON, ILL., July 26, 1961.
Representative PETER F. MACK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

The Illinois Agricultural Association is disturbed to learn that plans are under consideration by the Federal Communications Commission which would curtail or extensively alter the television service to rural areas in the central and eastern portions of Illinois. We feel that deintermixture of the Champaign-Urbana-Decatur market to all-UHF service would be detrimental to television viewing in this area.

For the past 7½ years station WCIA on channel 3 from Champaign, Ill., has

Whereas attention is hereby directed to the honors to be accorded this State by the special centennial prayer services for all Kansas citizens to be held at the Washington Cathedral, Washington, D.C., at the hours of 11 o'clock in the morning and 4 o'clock in the afternoon of Sunday, the 20th day of August 1961, and at which Kansas Day services the Kansas flag will be expressly honored in a ceremony in which Congressmen and Senators serving Kansas will participate; and

Whereas the purposes and objectives of those citizens of Kansas seeking to secure a Kansas bell for permanent installation in the tower of the Washington National Cathedral in the Capital are an honor to the religious heritage of the people of Kansas and a goal worthy of the prayers and support of all Kansans. Now, therefore, I, John Anderson, Jr., Governor of the State of Kansas, do hereby proclaim Sunday, August 20, 1961, as Special Centennial Prayer and Thanksgiving Day in Kansas.

Done at the capitol in Topeka under the great seal of the State, this Friday, July 28, A.D. 1961.

By the Governor:

JOHN ANDERSON, JR.
PAUL R. SHANAHAN,
Secretary of State.

"My Trip to Washington"—Prize Essays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the latter part of June a group of students of the Rumson-Fair Haven Regional High School, Rumson, N.J., came to Washington on their summer school historical tour, and visited my office. These young people were very much alive to the responsibilities of citizenship and their enthusiasm and interest made a definite impression on me. I offered prizes for the best essays that they would write about their trip to Washington. The offer was accepted and I have received the selections made of the best essays that were written.

The first prize was won by Rachael Lemberg, the second prize by Joan Low, and the third prize by Sandra Blodgett. I am grateful for the opportunity to insert these essays in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MY TRIP TO WASHINGTON

(By Rachael Lemberg, 10th grade, Rumson-Fair Haven Regional High School, Rumson, N.J., July 1961)

(First prize)

To me Washington is the hub of a giant wheel. The wheel is the United States; Washington is the center of it. It is in Washington that our laws are made, our guests from foreign nations stay, the world's greatest citizen protection agency is housed and culture is carried. In Washington people from all over our great country and other countries meet to talk, visit, and observe.

They talk in the Pan American Union Building about the future of our southern neighbors and the Communist threat to the security of their nations as well as ours.

But more important are the talks in the Capitol Building. These are discussions concerning the affairs at home.

They visit the monuments of America's

great leaders, the monuments built and dedicated to men like Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, men who strived for liberty, justice, and equality for all. These men and many others like them were not afraid to voice their convictions and live by them.

We, like many other visitors, came to Washington to visit and observe. We observed our Government in action in the Capitol Building, and we visited the world's largest protection agency.

One of the highlights of my trip was the personal visit to Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. We were very fortunate to have met Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, for he is one of the most honored and busiest men in the House. Earlier that same day Mr. AUCHINCLOSS was in conference with the President. At this time I would like to personally thank Mr. AUCHINCLOSS for his time and trouble in trying to make our visit to Washington a more enjoyable one.

In the Capitol Building we saw the most beautiful artwork and architecture in the world. As we entered the great rotunda, I was overwhelmed by the grandeur of the dome and the walls. I am sure that we have the most beautiful Capitol Building in the world. Another room which fascinated me was the room used when John Adams was President. I call this the whisper room because even a whisper can be heard in any part of the room as clearly as a bell. Statuary Hall also impressed me with the beautiful statues of some of America's great men.

While we were in the Capitol Building we sat in on the Senate while they discussed 40-year mortgages. At first I didn't realize the importance of 40-year mortgages. Then, after thinking about it, I understood President Kennedy's way of thinking. Forty-year mortgages would enable men and women to purchase their own homes by spreading out the payments over 40 years. The President feels that if all Americans owned their own homes, communism wouldn't have a chance. It is hard to persuade a stockholder to sell his stock if it is gaining value by the day. In the same way, it is hard to persuade an American to "sell" his "stock" in America if it is gaining value by the day.

We also sat in on the House of Representatives. Here they discussed the appointment of Gen. Maxwell Taylor to the position of the President's personal military adviser. This was quite a heated discussion. Many of the speakers thought that the President had too many advisers. Others thought that if he had several advisers who were capable, it would enable him to make decisions which would better the people of America and of the world.

In the FBI Building we saw all the devices used by the Bureau in tracking down and capturing criminals. In the lab we saw a woman gently scraping blood off a boot which would be examined later and used for evidence. In another room we saw how fingerprints were made and classified. This in itself is an extremely difficult and time-consuming job. What made it more interesting is that our guides were actual FBI agents who have had experience in handling dangerous cases similar to the ones they told about. These men know what they are doing and what they are looking for. With this in mind, I left with confidence in my law protection agency and in the men and women who make it what it is.

After visiting everything in the city we took a ride out to Arlington National Cemetery. There we saw the changing of the guard. I felt a pang of sadness in my heart, but I also felt proud. I thought of the many, many men who died so we could continue to live in peace and freedom. At times I wonder if those men died in vain. Russia and communism are a threat to our security and peace. We have no peace and will not have peace until Russia and the United States can stop quarreling; until countries like Laos, Cuba, and Israel can settle their own disputes in a manner best fitting to them.

As we rode home I thought about Russia and her people. I wondered if they were happy. I came to the conclusion that they don't really know what happiness is. I feel that I am happy. Whatever the people of Russia may have, they don't have freedom—my most precious possession. To me freedom is to be able to speak, write, listen, pray, and visit as you choose. A visit to the Capital is proof of freedom in action.

MY TRIP TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

(By Joan Low, 10th grade, Rumson-Fair Haven Regional High School, Rumson, N.J., July 1961)

(Second prize)

After a long, fun- and song-filled bus trip from Rumson, N.J., we arrived in Washington, D.C. All 24 of us were in high spirits and eager to see the city.

Our first stop was the Capitol Building. We walked up the many steps and were met by our guide in a central part of the building. We were spectators in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. It was awe-inspiring to watch the men, whose thoughts and action help form the laws that affect the lives of several million people.

We met with Representative AUCHINCLOSS, a man for whom I have great respect. He was extremely nice to us, and I was impressed that he took time from his work and used it to speak to a group of students from his hometown.

The next point of interest was the wax museum where the likenesses of many of our famous heroes could be seen in true-to-life waxen figures. Their appearance is so real you almost want to walk up and talk to them. The Four Chaplains appealed the most to me. The rocking boat and the realistic figures were almost ghostly.

After a lunch break, we were off to the FBI headquarters. In touring the building we were told and shown the various methods and equipment used in tracking down some of the most notorious criminals. It gives you quite a feeling of admiration for the men who help to make this country a better place in which to live by apprehending dangerous men.

The Pan American Building was our next stop. This building is used for the meetings of the delegates of all the American countries, with the exception of Canada. The most impressive part was the tropical garden in a centralized court. Due to the tropical plants from South America and Central America you felt as if you were walking into a jungle when you entered.

Then we went to see the various monuments erected to the memory of our well-remembered heroes. The Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials are examples of classical Greek architecture. Contained in each of these buildings is a statue of the man to whom the structure was dedicated. When you stand before the Lincoln Memorial, you feel as if he is really alive and you can feel his greatness, which seems to come from his deep-set, compelling eyes.

The Washington Monument is the most magnificent shaft in existence. It stands as a tall spire piercing the sky and stands for the glory and power of George Washington whose height was reached when he became the first President of a young Nation.

Next we went to Mount Vernon, the magnificent home of George Washington. It is one of the best remaining examples of the gracious plantations of the Old South. In it I can see the smooth, comfortable life of a southern family in Virginia. I can also see the slaves—people who were bought and sold like pieces of furniture. Now, two hundred years later, we still have a problem. The Civil War freed the slaves but did little to really unite all of the people of our Nation. This segregation problem was the only disappointing portion of our trip.

This trip was the best I have ever taken, for I learned while greatly enjoying myself

in the company of my friends. I learned much about the city, things that you have to see yourself, not read or hear about.

MY TRIP TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

(By Sandra Blodgett, 10th grade, Rumson-Fair Haven Regional High School, Rumson, N.J., July 1961)

(Third prize)

Recently I was privileged to be one of 24 students who participated in a trip to and tours of Washington, D.C. The trip was made enjoyable by the enthusiasm of the students and the pleasurable accommodations which had been arranged for us. As well as having a great deal of fun, we were able to see our Nation's Capital in cross-section, and we were very much impressed by the city. Our group visited monuments and historic landmarks as well as agencies of the present Federal Government, so we were able to view a growth of the Government from the time of our forefathers to present day.

I feel that my trip was beneficial in several ways:

1. Seeing the workings of our Federal Government strengthened my faith in the democratic principles on which our Nation is based. As I toured the Capital, and viewed the different branches of Government in operation, my convictions as to the superiority of democracy over all opposing types of government were confirmed. An example of this was our visits to meetings of the Senate and House of Representatives. At these meetings we saw the actual debates of issues which are now affecting us all, either directly or indirectly. This impressed me a great deal.

2. The Capital stirred my national pride and patriotism by emphasizing the greatness and might of our country. My trips through the awe-inspiring buildings of Washington reaffirmed my feelings of dedication and responsibility to my native land, and I felt as if the future greatness of this Nation depended upon me as a young citizen of the democracy.

3. The trip gave me a greater knowledge of the Federal Government and its organization. As I saw agencies of our Government in action I was more clearly able to visualize the overall organization of our Federal system. The FBI tour, for example, gave me a greater understanding of this governmental agency.

4. By visiting monuments and historic landmarks, I began to appreciate more fully the background of our Nation as it was laid by our forefathers. The deeds of these great men added still further to the new-found national pride which such a trip helped me to obtain.

I am firmly convinced, as a result of my trip to Washington, that it would be of great value if every high-school student were able to visit the Capital. The pride and patriotism which such a visit inspires helps to insure our country of able leaders for the future and an active and dedicated youth for the present.

Communist Techniques To Protect the Government From Its People

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in free societies police departments are or-

ganized to protect the people from any lawless element which may be loose in the community. The following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune reminds us that in Communist-dominated countries, police work consists mainly of protecting the government from its people.

A NEW WEAPON OF SUPPRESSION

Recent photographs from Berlin showed a group of anti-Communist demonstrators being sprayed from a machine that looks a little like an army tank, shoots water instead of bullets, and has a pillbox on top to protect the gunner—or maybe we should call him the pipe man, which is what the fire department calls the man assigned to hold the nozzle of a hose and aim the stream of water.

The Communists did not build this machine on the spur of the moment. It was designed and assembled to serve a purpose, and the marking on the truck in the picture—K51—suggests that there may be others like it.

The weapon doesn't seem to be designed for war, because it would be about as useless in battle as a child's water pistol and wouldn't last 5 minutes against modern artillery.

It isn't designed for legitimate police work, because a legitimate police department doesn't often have to use force to disperse mobs, and when it wants to spray them with water it can count on all the help it needs from the fire department. The need for a special armored water cannon has never occurred to American policemen, we are told. The Communist weapon can no doubt be adapted to shoot other liquids as well as water—burning kerosene, for instance, or possibly some kinds of acid.

The only plausible explanation for such an instrument is to combat mass uprisings such as the Communists have encountered in various places including East Germany and have good reason to expect there again.

This is police work in reverse. It is protecting the lawless minority from the people. Mr. Khrushchev may go on telling the world that the satellite countries are happy under his Red thumb and that the only troublemakers are a few imperialist agents. But an armored, mob-dispersing tank truck is an odd instrument to use against a few imperialist agents. His lies are drowned out by the roar of its water.

Neither Radical nor Reactionary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I recently mentioned to the Members of this body that I was disappointed in the number of my constituents who answered the questionnaire I sent out this year. I mailed about 104,500, but received back only 10 percent. This, of course, was my opinion. On the other hand, an editorial that appeared in the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald on July 30, 1961, said the number who answered the questionnaire "represents a high return for such surveys." Perhaps the Herald is correct.

Regardless of this point, the Herald aptly hit on the truth that the voters in my district are neither radical nor reactionary. They are people who have

commonsense and who have a sense of public responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial which follows:

PUBLIC IS SMARTER THAN SOME PEOPLE IN WASHINGTON BELIEVE

The poll of constituents by Congressman JACK WESTLAND confirms some things we had suspected all along.

WESTLAND, who sends his questionnaires out annually, concedes that the questions are difficult to answer yes or no, but points out that this is the kind of choice Congressmen are faced with making on all national issues, the answers to many of which are anything but simple.

Anyway, back to those feelings we've had that the poll results, as reported in Wednesday's Herald, verify.

First, we think people are smarter than many politicians give them credit for. And more responsible, too. Most of the respondents felt that reduced Federal spending is the best way to handle the national debt. Failing that, more persons believed higher taxes are necessary to balance the budget. The smallest bloc consisted of those who thought increasing the Federal debt is okay. In this area, it would seem the administration is out of step with the public. The Federal debt has been rising with every new report and apparently President Kennedy's advisers are neither concerned about it nor see any need to apply the brakes.

On Federal aid to education, slightly more than half of the voters opposed Federal funds for school construction. And three-fourths said no to Federal support of teachers' salaries. Yet, because of the administration's insistence that help for federally impacted school districts—Blaine and Oak Harbor, for instance—be tied up in the overall bill pinned to Federal aid, there is danger that this needed support may be lost to those districts, in view of the lack of popular support for the overall Federal aid principle. Kitsap County districts, educating children of navy yard workers, figure to lose \$400,000 on this political maneuver.

In other categories, Westland's constituents showed themselves to be well informed and politically moderate. The majority of the voters are neither radical nor reactionary, it seems to us. Rather they show a degree of commonsense that surpasses that of some of the people in Washington.

Of course, the 10,000 answers mailed to the Congressman may not duplicate in all respect the consensus in the Second Congressional District, though 10 percent does represent a high return for such surveys. The fact that they took the time and made the effort to answer the poll speaks well for their sense of public responsibility and thus they may be something of an "elite" group from that standpoint. It may be, to paraphrase an old Marine Corps expression, that this is the 10 percent that does get the word.

The Senate Accepts Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1961

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the August 16 issue of the Troy Record newspaper, Troy, N.Y., entitled "The Senate Accepts Uncle Sam."

As stated in the editorial, the Senate this week approved Troy's Uncle Sam Resolution. Through this action the recognition of Uncle Sam Wilson as the progenitor of America's national symbol is a step closer to reality. Representative LEO W. O'BRIEN and I have introduced concurrent resolutions in the House to accomplish this same objective and we hope that prompt and favorable action will be taken by the House during this session of Congress.

The editorial is as follows:

THE SENATE ACCEPTS UNCLE SAM

The hope that Troy's Samuel Wilson, progenitor of the Uncle Sam who is this country's national symbol, will receive official recognition is at its brightest. However, complacency should not be permitted to take over for the battle is not yet won.

Senate approval finally has come and by a margin which indicates that Troy's claim to the title is being generally accepted. But the House has yet to act. Sometime within the next 2 weeks when the House consideration is due, one of those unexpected pitfalls may develop which hinders progress.

This is the time publicly to support recognition for Uncle Sam's campaign. Sentiment, adequately expressed, can be important in swaying the decision of House members.

That Troy's Samuel Wilson has deserved this honor can hardly be contradicted. When the Senate debated the resolution, the sole objection came from Senator HART, of Michigan, and he failed to make known his reasons for opposing action.

Indiana, which has been the principal contender with Troy for the honor has virtually ceased to agitate. There has been tacit admission that the Samuel Wilson buried at Merriam, Ind., is not the man who led to the creation of a national symbol. There was a similarity of names but little else.

On the other hand, historical data substantiates every claim made concerning Samuel Wilson, born in Arlington, Mass., and a resident of Troy. Samuel Wilson was a patriot of the first order, he was a respected citizen and he was the meatpacker who marked his barrels of beef in the manner which led to the coining of the term "Uncle Sam."

Ever since the War of 1812, Troy has been accepted as the home of the original Uncle Sam. It was only when efforts were made to place this recognition on official basis that counterclaims arose.

As far as Trojans are concerned, this is the crucial period in the fight. The Senate has given its approval but the House still must act. There must be no let down in the effort to bring this campaign to successful fruition. The Samuel Wilson who made Troy his home unquestionably is the Uncle Sam who is part of history. Certainly the time is opportune to cease the quibbling and make it official.

**News Accounts of Administration Policy
in Dealing With Reds Are Disturbing**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, following the President's address to the Nation in which he outlined the seriousness of the

Berlin situation and alerted the country to possible Communist moves there, many were encouraged that he would take immediate and effective action should the Russians create new incidents. Now, from the news stories quoting administration spokesmen, we are disturbed to find that the bold action promised is merely another series of protests to which the Communists pay little heed. Mr. Speaker, apparently we have not yet convinced Khrushchev that we will really fight to protect the freedom of the people of Berlin, that we are prepared to go to war to halt any further Communist aggression anywhere in the world, and that we will use every weapon at our command to win any war they start. Such a statement of determined policy is the best guarantee we have that war will be prevented. The greatest danger that we will become involved in war is that Khrushchev, mistaking our hesitancy to act as a sign of weakness, will make the inevitable mistake that will lead to a hot war.

So that we may have at hand a ready reference of how the administration is handling the critical situation created by the Communists in Berlin, I include the following articles from the New York Times of August 15, 1961.

WEST PROTESTS TO SOVIET ON BERLIN BORDER

**CLOSING; UNITED STATES SEES PROPAGANDA
GAIN—ALLIES ADAMANT—EAST GERMANS
WARN OF NEW BLOCKADE IF TRADE IS
STOPPED**

(By Sydney Gruson)

BERLIN, August 15.—The United States, Britain, and France formally protested to the Soviet Union today against Communist East Germany's closing of the border between East and West Berlin.

The allied powers described the Communist action as "illegal" and the "most flagrant violation" of the four-power agreements on Berlin since the Soviet blockade of West Berlin in 1948.

The Communists had no immediate reaction to the protest, which they are expected to dismiss. However, a few hours after the protest note was delivered, the East German Government warned West Germany that another blockade of the overland route to West Berlin could result from any cancellation of the trade agreement between the two countries.

BATTLE OF WORDS RENEWS

This has been one of the countermeasures under consideration by Bonn in retaliation for the Communist's sealing off of East Berlin.

West German goods on which West Berlin's economic life is dependent would be barred from East German roads and railways if the agreement was canceled, the East German statement warned.

With the allies' protest and the East German declaration the situation here was returning to a battle of words.

None of the words, however, changed the fact that the intercity border had been effectively closed, that the flood of refugees from East Berlin and East Germany had been slowed to a trickle and that, to all intents and purposes, a state border had been created out of the intercity border.

BAN ON VEHICLES ENFORCED

The border itself was quiet and the Communists apparently felt confident it would remain so. They reduced their military strength at the border and took away about half of the 50 tanks they had stationed not far behind to deter resistance by the East Berliners to their harsh measures.

The latest of these measures, barring West Berlin vehicles from entering East Berlin without a special permit, was rigidly enforced.

The Brandenburg Gate, the main crossing point on the border where tension had been great for the last 2 days, remained closed. Barbed wire and concrete blocks were placed across the front of the huge monument during the night.

The Communists were allowing East Berliners to approach within 200 yards of the Brandenburg Gate today. This narrowed the no man's land for civilians created yesterday when trouble threatened to break out at the gate between West Berliners and Communist troops and policemen.

The West Berliners were still being kept about a half mile from the monument. In any case a heavy early morning downpour and intermittent showers during the day cut the crowds down, easing the task of the police on both sides. Taking no chances, however, the West Berlin Government put its entire police force of 18,000 men on a "maximum alert" around the clock.

CITY'S MOOD PESSIMISTIC

West Berlin's mood tonight, with Allied action confined so far to the protest, was one of pessimism and disappointment. The conviction was general that an important round had been lost to the Communists.

In East Berlin, only a few moments of conversation with Communist officials was sufficient to show how cocky they felt over the way the situation was developing.

"There are no more refugees to worry about, so why don't you agree now to our solution for West Berlin?" one of the officials said.

The leaders of the West Berlin trade union federation called on the allies not to confine themselves to formal protests but to undertake "economic sanctions."

A spokesman for the West Berlin Government said it could be assumed that the commandants' protest would not be the last word of the Allies.

REPRESSION IS CHARGED

The Allied protest said the East Germans' repressive measures had been taken because the people under their control, deeply perturbed by the threats on Berlin recently launched by Communist leaders, were fleeing in large numbers to the West.

In closing the border to the East Berliners and East Germans, the Allies said, East German military and paramilitary units had turned the Soviet sector of East Berlin into an armed camp.

The Allies noted that the agreement of June 20, 1949, formally ending the blockade had also been broken. In this agreement, they said, the Soviet Union pledged to facilitate movement within Berlin and between Berlin and the rest of Germany.

The protest took the form of a letter by the three Western commandants of Berlin—Maj. Gen. Alfred Watson 2d of the United States, Brig. Gen. Jean Lacombe of France, and Maj. Gen. Sir Rohan Delaccombe of Britain. It was addressed to the Soviet commandant, Col. Andrei V. Solov'yev, and delivered by hand to the Soviet Army's Berlin headquarters in the East Berlin district of Karlshorst.

ALLIED LINKS UNMENTIONED

The East German warning on trade said nothing specific about the Allies' communications with their garrisons in West Berlin.

However, when West Germany gave notice last year of its intention to cancel the trade agreement, the East Germans said the Allied communications to Berlin would be affected, as well as those of West Germany.

An annex of the trade agreement covers the payment by the West Germans for the use of the roads and railway lines from the West German border over East German territory to West Berlin—110 miles.

Last year's West German notice of cancellation, given then in retaliation for Communist restrictions on West German travel to East Germany and East Berlin, was eventually withdrawn and the agreement prolonged, although most of the restrictions remained.

ALLIES RUN TRAINS

The Allies operate 48 military passenger trains each week between West Berlin and West Germany and a number of freight trains to supply the garrisons. These are in addition to their traffic on the autobahn between Helmstedt on the West German frontier and West Berlin.

The trains are pulled by East German locomotives between the East German border and West Berlin and the annex sets out the payments for these services. West Germany has paid the costs of the Allied trains.

"Any attempts to talk to the German Democratic Republic from a position of strength and to exert economic pressure on it are doomed to failure," the Communist statement said. It was issued in the name of the Council of Ministers.

Cancellation of the trade agreement would automatically cancel the annex, the statement said, and would be a blow against West Berlin.

The statement said that West German leaders should learn that the German Democratic Republic is a sovereign state and that the use of its communications will only be tolerated on a contractual basis.

"This means," it added, "in complete agreement with the usual norms of international law."

The first reaction to the Communist warning came from the Free Democrats, one of West Germany's opposition parties. The Free Democrats conceded that the trade agreement and Berlin's communications were linked and said the Communists should not be given a pretext for blocking access.

The West Berlin city government, in a letter to the three Western commandants, proposed the establishment of a joint commission to examine possible countermeasures that could be taken here.

Possible steps included action to prevent 13,000 West Berliners from working in East Berlin and the assumption of responsibility for the elevated railway on West Berlin territory. This is now operated by the East Germans and, along with the subway, was cut by the border-closing decrees.

No one seemed sure, however, that something else would or even could be done. The travel documents East German officials need to go to the West were still being issued today. They were stopped last year as part of the counteraction against the restrictions imposed then on West German travel to East Germany.

The Communist border police were checking all West Berlin cars trying to enter the eastern sector today. The Communists set up two offices in East Berlin where West Berliners could apply for the special permits now needed to take their cars to the eastern sector.

The permits were not being granted easily. The car of Cardinal Julius Doepfner, former Bishop of Berlin and now Archbishop of Munich, was one of those refused permission to cross. The Cardinal, who still administers the Berlin diocese, crossed on foot.

At some of the border crossing points the identity of pedestrians from West Berlin was checked against lists by the Communist policemen. They apparently were looking for persons who had fled from East Berlin or East Germany.

The only potentially serious incident of the day occurred at the Friedrichstrasse crossing point, the main one, now that the Brandenburg Gate has been closed.

A crowd of West Berliners massed near the border there whistling and hooting at

every East Berlin car returning to the Communist sector. The crowd, mainly of young people, threw some stones and once surged forward to get an East Berlin car. They rocked it until West Berlin policemen intervened and dispersed them.

REFUGEES SWIM CANALS

The exact figures on refugees filtering through the tight network was no longer being given. The few who were still getting over were mainly escaping by swimming canals and late today the Communists began building a six-foot wooden barrier along the canals.

One couple escaping over a canal drew revolver fire when spotted by the police, but got across safely.

There were two unexpected refugees during the day. One of the armed factory workers, the supposedly hard-core Communists who have been on guard duty since Saturday night, came across in his battle dress.

A policeman still carrying his submachine gun also fled. He complained to the West Berlin police that he had been on duty 26 hours and had had only two plates of soup for meals all that time.

REDS HELD LOSING—WASHINGTON TO STRESS EAST GERMAN MOVE CONFESSES FAILURE

(By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON, August 15.—The Kennedy administration set out today to portray East Germany's closing of the border between East and West Berlin as a dramatic confession of Communist failure.

The highest officials here indicated that this would be the extent, for the time being, of the Allied response to Communist moves in Berlin. As long as Western rights of access to the divided city are respected, the officials said, protest and vigorous propaganda will be their primary form of retaliation.

At the same time, the administration continued to call attention to its plans for a steady military buildup. In what are likely to be daily progress reports on the partial mobilization, the administration hopes to convince the Soviet Union that it will be at peak strength for either conventional or nuclear warfare by the end of the year.

AIR FORCE TO KEEP MEN ON

The Air Force announced a program to keep 28,000 men on active duty past their normal terms. It will call for volunteers but will freeze other men in the Air Force for periods of up to 1 year under the authorization to increase its strength by as many as 65,000 men. The Air Force's present strength is about 822,000.

Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., Secretary of the Army, has scheduled a news conference for tomorrow afternoon. One report was that he would alert 111 Army Reserve units for possible call to active duty later this year. Pentagon officials have emphasized that they are trying to give all reservists the longest possible period to prepare for active duty.

Retaliation by economic sanctions against the Soviet bloc continued to be discussed among the allies. But Washington, at least, appeared convinced that an effective embargo would be extremely difficult to arrange and must in any case be held in reserve for future showdowns.

Despite pressures, especially from West Germany, for a harsher response to the closing of the Berlin border, the administration has decided to make a worldwide show of reasonableness while trying to make Moscow pay a heavy propaganda price for its action.

West Germany's Ambassador in Washington, Dr. Wilhelm Grewe, said a protest note on Berlin would probably be sent to Moscow "in the very near future." More than "theoretical" measures would be taken by the West against the new East Berlin refugee

barriers, he predicted, but he did not elaborate.

One protest note was sent today by the United States, British, and French commandants in West Berlin to the Soviet commandant.

Dr. Grewe made his comments after a 2½-hour meeting of Big Four representatives at the State Department. He said the group had yet to finish its discussions of the Berlin situation and would resume talks tomorrow.

On hand for today's meeting were Foy D. Kohler, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs; Viscount Hood, Minister of the British Embassy, and Claude Lebel, Minister Counsellor of the French Embassy.

One of the leading members of the administration said the Communists had handed the West a ready-made and first-class story to tell.

The confession that East Germany could not hold its people against the attraction of a free West Berlin and West Germany, he contended, put the West in an excellent position to persuade the world of the need to preserve the status quo in the Western part of the city.

If this argument, buttressed by telling photographs of East Germans behind barbed wire, is effectively made, the official said, it may lead to pressures on Moscow for a peaceful settlement of the whole Berlin problem.

BOLDER APPROACH SEEN

There were indications here also that the administration would now be more bold in pressing its demands for an overall German settlement based on the self-determination of German people.

At some point in the developing diplomatic struggle, it now appears likely, the West will take this demand and the entire Berlin problem to the United Nations.

Other high officials in Washington were making essentially the same point today. Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles gave a part of the argument in an address at the National Press Club.

"Here in the very heart of Europe, we have had the competition for which Khrushchev has been pleading, and the results are clear: communism has failed," he said.

Mr. Bowles declared that after the "pathetic failure" Premier Khrushchev had shown himself to be a "poor loser."

"Indeed," the Under Secretary added, "he is now asking us to ball him out of his failure by agreeing to abandon the free people of West Berlin to the same system which has brought such misery to the people of East Germany."

The plan to tax Moscow with the counter-demand for the self-determination of Germans has been discussed here for several weeks. The administration has shown some concern, however, that such a propaganda effort, aimed primarily at the independence-minded peoples of the uncommitted nations, might at the same time encourage a popular uprising in East Germany.

Such an uprising, it was feared, might have drawn West Germany and the United States into open conflict with the Soviet army. Now that Moscow can demonstrate an apparent ability to suppress the East German populace, however, the self-determination argument is to be pressed.

ENVOYS TO PRESS CASE

As a part of the propaganda effort, U.S. Ambassadors throughout the world have been instructed to call personally upon the heads of government to whom they are accredited to advise them of every Western action in the Berlin crisis and to answer their questions.

The U.S. Information Agency also has been alerted to prepare calm but dramatic presentations of the closing of the East German frontier, the reasons for it and the attendant violations of Four-Power agreements on Germany.

Most important, it is planned that the highest Government officials will refer to the situation in all public appearances so as to fuse policy and propaganda efforts.

In the continuing planning for the still expected East-West negotiations over Berlin, almost no thought is being given here to any kind of recognition of the East German regime, sources indicate. The Berlin demonstration of the instability of East German Communist rule, Washington believes, confirms the wisdom of this decision.

But the West will again, as in past negotiations over Berlin, show a willingness to be flexible on the question of who controls the check points along the access routes to West Berlin.

In other words, the West might consider allowing the Soviet Union to appoint East Germans as agents in supervising traffic as long as Western rights to station troops in Berlin and to supply them remained.

The general confidence of the administration and its sense of propaganda victory last week end was tempered, however, by a continuing fear of miscalculation by the Soviet leadership.

There is still concern also about the ability of the Western alliance to withstand the Soviet pressure and about the position later this year of the Leftist-leaning neutral nations.

George F. Kennan, the U.S. Ambassador to Yugoslavia, conferred with President Kennedy this afternoon on this point and especially on plans to influence the meeting of twenty to thirty neutral heads of state in Belgrade starting September 1.

President Kennedy has been informed of all elements of the continuing consultations among the Western Allies. He scheduled a breakfast conference with Secretary of State Dean Rusk tomorrow, presumably for another review of the German issue.

Cuban Outrage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that Members of Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should have the benefit of a well-reasoned editorial broadcasted on Monday, July 31, 1961, by one of the Taft Broadcasting Co. stations, WKRC of Cincinnati, Ohio.

The editorial follows:

CUBAN OUTRAGE

The latest outrage of Castro's Cuba, involving the kidnapping of Americans and the theft of a U.S. airliner, should be the straw to break the camel's back. If they do not, the world must conclude that once-mighty Uncle Sam is merely a strawman. Fidel Castro has mocked and humiliated everything we stand for. In the midst of our bold show of strength in Berlin, he makes of us an international laughing stock.

The list of Castro's outrages against the United States is too well known to enumerate. In addition, he has slaughtered thousands and enslaved the remainder of his own people.

The role of the United States in this is beyond belief. First we encouraged him and virtually installed him in power; then we gave him the benefit of every doubt in his Russian-style bloodbath; then we looked the

other way when he looted over a billion dollars of American private property; then we helped him in his disgraceful attempt to extort ransom from us in the form of tractors for human beings.

The only time we showed any backbone was the halfhearted encouragement of the Cuban rebels into the Bay of Pigs invasion. But we chickened out just short of the air and sea support that would have made the invasion a success.

Now comes the final blow, and all we do is talk. The Eastern Electra incident is not even an act of piracy, for it occurred over American territory; it is a flagrant act of war. But our timidity knows no bounds. Our own Secretary of State excused giving Castro over a week to reply to our complaint on the incredible grounds that Castro might be too busy with his hate-America celebration of his Communist revolution. Now, believe it or not, the State Department has invited another slap in the face from the bearded bully by suggesting we might help him use the American courts to recover some Cuban aircraft impounded in this country for nonpayment of his debts.

A number of U.S. Senators, including Ohio's STEPHEN YOUNG, have demanded that we stop kidding around with this kill-crazy gangster and simply take back the stolen plane by whatever force is necessary. The American public is cheering such a move now.

President Kennedy has rallied the Nation in support of his firm stand in Berlin. He would have the same overwhelming support if he decided today to draw freedom's sword and drive this brutal, dangerous tyrant from the Western Hemisphere.

Mayors Do Not Want Federal Interference in Local Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, it may come as a surprise to many people that Federal grants and loans to local governments are regarded more as a curse than as dollars from heaven. The fact is that as Federal assistance to local governments increases local autonomy decreases.

The mayors of the cities of Arcadia, Pomona, San Marino, and Whittier, which are located in my district, have sent me telegrams apprising me of their deep concern over the growing number of Federal advances into local affairs. Under unanimous consent, I include the telegrams in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Telegram from the Honorable Jess Balser, mayor, Arcadia, Calif.: "The city of Arcadia has expressed itself on numerous occasions as being opposed to municipalities receiving Federal grants-in-aid. We feel that our American communities are capable of carrying out their responsibilities without such programs. You are respectfully requested to present these views to the Congressional Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations."

Telegram from the Honorable James S. Baker, mayor, Pomona, Calif.: "Pomona believes periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to State and local gov-

ernments as proposed under H.R. 7802 to be desirable legislative control. However, we are concerned with growing number of Federal advances into local functions. Local governments should be expected and required to provide all necessary services. Believe vast majority of cities desire this. Only in cases where National interest clearly requires Federal action should U.S. Government become involved."

Telegram from the Honorable Harry W. Hitchcock, mayor, San Marino, Calif.: "I am generally opposed to grants-in-aid for purely local purposes. It is wasteful and extravagant. Local needs should be determined, controlled, and whenever possible financed locally. Communities will then determine what they require and can afford to spend. Activities financed by grants are thought by many to cost nothing, to be paid by others which is often true, or that the tax for such grants will be assessed regardless and every community should obtain as much as possible whether urgently needed or not."

Telegram from the Honorable Roy C. Morris, mayor, Whittier, Calif.: "Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee could serve the States and cities well in things like Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority on rapid transit problems or States on power and water financing this would benefit the small towns. Also, I think most of the small towns in this section are in good shape financially with their sales tax income."

Patuxent, Md., Test Center Mess Declared Navy's Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1961

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an article from the Baltimore Sunday Sun of August 13, 1961, reporting the selection of the enlisted men's mess at the Naval Test Center in Patuxent River, Md., as the Navy's best.

We in the Fifth Maryland Congressional District are proud of the many defense establishments located in our area. We are glad to have defense personnel as our friends and neighbors. And when an unusual, but well deserved, accolade comes to one of these installations, we feel justified in sharing the feeling of pride which results.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, as the Representative in Congress in the district in which the Naval Test Center is located, and as an American, I want to extend my congratulations to the officers and men who operate the Patuxent River enlisted men's mess on being judged the best Navy mess in the world.

PATUXENT MESS RATED NAVY'S BEST—CLEANLINESS AND GOOD FOOD ACCLAIMED BY TEAM OF EXPERT INSPECTORS

(By Albert Sehistedt, Jr., Sun staff correspondent)

PATUXENT RIVER, Md., August 12.—It is a fairly ordinary looking messhall. A little cleaner than most, perhaps; and there are curtains and artificial flowers at the windows.

Yet a visitor would observe nothing exceptional about this enlisted men's feeding place at the Naval Test Center here.

The Patuxent general mess, however, has one very noteworthy attribute: It is the best Navy mess in the world.

JUDGMENT OF INSPECTORS

The accolade is not an off-the-cuff commendation from a man who happened to get a good steak here but the considered judgment of a team of expert inspectors working under the auspices of the Secretary of the Navy.

Each year the Navy holds a worldwide contest to select the best mess. The judges are an officer of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, a medical officer, a line officer, and a civilian representative of the Food Service Executives Association, a business organization of hotelmen and caterers.

At 4 p.m., July 5, the Secretary of the Navy's office notified the Patuxent mess that in the opinion of these judges it was No. 1 in the world. The mess people here broke out the beer.

HAPPIER THAN EVER

"I have been in food service for 18 years, and I was happier then than I have ever been," said WO Gerald Barlow, assistant commissary officer. "The feeling was something you can't bring out in words."

What is so good about the Patuxent mess? Begin with a glance at one week's menu.

On Wednesday, for example, the Patuxent sailors could put on their mess trays: Roast beef and/or pork chops, parsley potatoes, beans, cauliflower au gratin, any one of seven salads from a special salad bar, devil's food cake, ice cream, rolls, several kinds of bread, milk and, as always in the Navy, plenty of strong coffee.

FRIED CHICKEN ON TUESDAY

Persons not fond of roast beef or pork chops might have enjoyed Tuesday's dinner which included fried chicken and baked ham. On Friday there was a choice of oyster stew, scallops, spiced shrimp and beef fricassee.

But a menu is only printed words on a piece of paper. How does the food taste?

This visitor, paying an unexpected call, found the food comparable to any good restaurant in Baltimore. Food on a tin tray will never look as appetizing as the same thing on expensive china under soft lights, but taste buds make these distinctions.

The man with the overall responsibility for Patuxent's mess is Lt. (j.g.) James C. Owens, commissary officer. His job, briefly, is to make sure that three times a day the food is cooked, then served hot, on time and inexpensively.

"Saving Uncle Sam money is a definite factor in this program," Lieutenant Owens said. The Navy allows him \$1.11 per man, per day. At the main meal (noon dinner in the Navy), Lieutenant Owens and his aides serve 3,000 sailors.

Like any successful restaurant man, the lieutenant aims to please.

Meats and vegetables at Patuxent are never cooked in great bulk; no more than 25 servings are brought out to the steam-tables at any one time. Steaks are cooked on a grill as the chowline moves along, thus giving every man an opportunity to select a steak to order.

Ice cream is always available, but it is not served on the chowline.

"We put it in freezers around the mess-hall," Lieutenant Owens said. "We found that sailors sometimes left the ice cream because it melted on their trays before they got to it."

CRITICISM INVITED

Customer criticism is invited. Questionnaires are regularly handed out to the sailors by the messhall staff. Sample questions: "Is the menu variety satisfactory?"

"Does the cleanliness of the messhall meet with your approval?"

Cleanliness, a Navy tradition, was one of the major items in the messhall contest.

Lieutenant Owens and Mr. Barlow said the judges' inspection was so thorough that they even checked such things as the handles of spatulas for cracks that might harbor bacteria.

QUIZZED ON TEMPERATURES

One judge singled out a messman of minor rank, made him keep his eye directed toward the floor and ordered him to repeat from memory the temperatures at which food trays were to be washed and rinsed.

The lowly messman answered correctly, and played an unexpected part in Patuxent's triumph.

Sailors who had nothing to do with the mess were stopped on the streets of the base by the judges and asked their opinion of the food here. Opinions were duly noted.

The efficient operation of a mess was another big factor in the contest. Patuxent's efficiency even extends to the garbage, which is actually a source of income to the mess—it is sold to farmers for their livestock.

Flies, a perennial problem for many food dispensers, have been defeated at Patuxent. Large fans are placed in front of the screen doors of the messhall. The blast is so strong, from the point of view of the fly, that the insects simply cannot get in when a door opens and a human passes through.

All these things counted in Patuxent's selection as the best. Lieutenant Owens was asked what, in his opinion, really brought Patuxent the honor.

"I think it was the interest of mess personnel, which the judges must have seen," he replied. "They were anxious to please and eager to win."

South Bend Tribune Endorses Long-Range Planning Authority in Foreign-Aid Bill—President of Studebaker-Packard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district in a State which is often regarded as isolationist, Indiana.

One of the most important newspapers in my State, the South Bend Tribune, which is also the largest newspaper in my congressional district, is a Republican newspaper which in the four campaigns that I have conducted for Congress has not once failed to endorse my Republican opponent.

The editor and publisher of the South Bend Tribune is one of the most distinguished citizens of Indiana, Mr. Franklin D. Schurz, who is not only very active in the civic affairs of our community but is also this year a member of the board of directors of the Associated Press. Mr. Schurz has also served as a delegate to both the Republican National Convention and the Republican State Convention of Indiana.

For these reasons, I believe that particular significance should be paid to the fact that this week, on August 15, 1961,

the South Bend Tribune went on record as strongly endorsing the request of President Kennedy for long-term borrowing authority under the new foreign aid program.

Although I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that a number of editorials have been read this afternoon during the debate, I am nonetheless taking the liberty of reading into the RECORD, the South Bend Tribune editorial to which I have referred because I believe it of such significance. The fact that an Indiana Republican newspaper should support the President's earnest request for such authority is not only a tribute to the sense of national interest of the newspaper, but is, I believe, an indication that responsible leadership in the Midwest is deeply aware of our international responsibilities in the struggle against communism and is concerned to see us meet those responsibilities in an intelligent and businesslike way.

The editorial follows:

LONG-RANGE PLANNING BOOST

The defeat in the Senate of the foreign aid bill amendment that would have required the administration to go to Congress annually for appropriations to finance its \$8.8 billion economic development loan fund was a clear cut victory for the Kennedy forces.

The greatest significance of the 56-39 vote against the amendment, though, lies in the fact that it is indicative of a change in thinking in Congress on the whole spectrum of foreign aid. For it reflects growing support for long-range planning as a basic element to the success of foreign aid as opposed to year-to-year arrangements which have obvious drawbacks.

In considering the matter, which has caused such a furor in Congress, it is essential to keep two important facts in mind.

Foreign aid is a fact of life so far as the United States and its people as individuals and taxpayers are concerned. It is going to be around for a long time.

Long-range economic development plans for the backward countries that we are trying to help cannot be managed efficiently on a year-to-year hand-to-mouth basis.

It is also well to remember that the so-called back-door authority sought by the administration in this case does not apply to all of the foreign aid program but only to the development loans repayable in dollars on a long-term basis.

It has been noted that the request does ask for a certain trust in the executive branch of the Government. It does. But Congress still can keep an eagle eye on what is going on and it should. It should hold administrators and the administration responsible by keeping close tabs on what is going on.

But the risks involved in what has been described at various times as stop-and-go planning in the handling of the foreign aid program also are apparent and the advantages in long-range planning outweigh the risks taken in long-term commitment.

It is time to introduce long-range planning to many phases of our foreign relief program. Applying it to the development loan fund is a good place to start.

TELEGRAM FROM SHERWOOD EGERT

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take this opportunity to read into the RECORD a brief telegram I have received from another distinguished citizen of my district and State, Mr. Sherwood H. Egbert, president of the Studebaker-Packard Corp., in South Bend, endorsing the President's foreign aid program.

The telegram follows:

SOUTH BEND, IND.

The Honorable JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

As member of the Citizens Committee for International Development, I heartily endorse the sound position taken by you and your House colleagues who support the President's foreign assistance program. Every American taxpayer who recognizes the vital importance of strengthening the economies and defense of the underdeveloped nations will applaud your effort to assure that the aid program is conducted with maximum efficiency and effort.

SHERWOOD H. EGBERT.

Our Oversea Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely and deserving editorial from the National Tribune-Stars and Stripes for August 17, 1961:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

To the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars on the eve of your 62d national encampment, which starts in Miami Beach on Sunday, we wish for you a most successful and constructive meeting.

We know that your organization and your ladies auxiliary will convene for your annual encampment in a spirit of service to the Nation, the security of which is threatened from without. We know, too, that by your actions you will demonstrate that your membership commands the respect of the entire Nation.

In the past you have taken a determined stand against the threat of communism and have been especially vigilant in alerting the Nation as to the dangers of this menace.

The U.S. Supreme Court in recent months has upheld two of the major objectives of your organization with respect to the Communist Party. The Court declared that Communist-front organizations must register with the Attorney General and another decision makes it a crime to be a member of a party advocating the violent overthrow of this Government. We know that this action on the part of the Supreme Court brings a keen sense of satisfaction as a reward for your patriotic efforts.

In Detroit last year your delegates sounded the call for a stepup in the defense posture of this Nation. Once again your efforts are bearing fruit as the Chief Executive takes decisive steps to bolster the might of our Armed Forces. Undoubtedly proposals will be set forth at your Miami Beach meeting which will recommend to the President and the Congress legislation which will help safeguard the security of this Nation.

Your organization has been a leader in pressing for liberalized legislation for the aging veterans of World War I. You have been forthright in your declaration that a separate and liberalized pension program is necessary to care for the needs of these veterans. For this courageous action we extend to your own sincere commendation.

Under the leadership of your present commander in chief, Ted C. Connell, you have gained stature and prestige in the eyes of the Nation.

The members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars recognize that duty is the first call of

the Nation. They have answered that call once to meet the threat of America's enemies and now stand ready to again participate in the long, hard struggle to keep this Nation free.

We hope that you will enjoy the fun and horseplay that goes with every veteran convention, and we are confident that your actions will contribute materially to the future of our great country.

We wish you well.

Social Welfare Racket Has Become Vote-Getting Device

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, attempts to have the new welfare plan of the city of Newburgh, N.Y., declared illegal from the standpoint of State and Federal law make one thing clear: Social welfare has become a vote-getting device. George Todt discusses the Newburgh story in his column which appeared in the August 4, 1961, edition of the Los Angeles Herald Express. Under unanimous consent, I insert the column in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BLOCKING WELFARE CHEATS

"To get into the best society nowadays, one has either to feed people, amuse people, or shock people."—Wilde, "A Woman of No Importance."

(By George Todt)

One of the most glaring deficiencies of the social welfare state concept is that it makes so many crooks and chiselers out of people who otherwise might have amounted to something worthwhile.

What took place at Newburgh, N.Y., recently illustrates the point.

The city manager, the city council, and the vast majority of Newburgh citizens decided to have an end to the flagrant abuses of their welfare system. Accordingly they adopted a 13-point plan designed to cut down on fraudulent mooching and cheating by phonies.

What was the Newburgh plan? Why did it arouse so much consternation by the social welfare adepts? Why was it declared illegal by State and Federal law?

Judge this matter for yourselves. Here is the program:

"To Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, Albany, N.Y.

"From Citizens for Solvent Government.

WOULD YOU SAY

"We, the undersigned, do herewith execute the within petition in order to demonstrate our support for the underlying principles behind the action of the city manager and the Common Council of the City of Newburgh, Orange County, N.Y., in their adoption of a revised welfare plan. Following are 13 points of welfare relief changes to become effective in the city of Newburgh, N.Y., July 1, 1961.

"1. All cash payments which can be converted to food, clothing and rent vouchers and the like without basic harm to the intent of the aid shall be issued in voucher form henceforth.

"2. All able-bodied adult males on relief of any kind who are capable of working are to be assigned to the Chief of Building Maintenance for work assignment on a 40-hour week.

"3. All recipients physically capable of and available for private employment who are offered a job but refuse it, regardless of the type of employment involved, are to be denied relief.

"4. All mothers of illegitimate children are to be advised that should they have any more children out of wedlock, they shall be denied relief.

"THIS HERE PLAN

"5. All applicants for relief who have left a job voluntarily, i.e. who have not been fired or laid off, shall be denied relief.

"6. The allotment for any one family unit shall not exceed the take-home pay of the lowest paid city employee with a family of comparable size.

"7. No relief shall be granted to any family whose income is in excess of the latter figure.

"8. All applicants for relief who are new to the city must show evidence that their plans in coming to the city involved a concrete offer of employment similar to that required of foreign immigrants. All such persons shall be limited to 2 weeks of relief. Those who cannot show evidence shall be limited to 1 week of relief.

"9. Aid to persons except the aged, blind, and disabled, shall be limited to 3 months in any one year—this is a feature similar to the present policies in unemployment benefits.

"10. All recipients who are not disabled, or otherwise incapacitated, shall report to the Department of Public Welfare monthly for a conference regarding the status of their case.

"BLOCKED THE WAY

"11. Once the budget for the fiscal year is approved by the council, it shall not be exceeded by the welfare department unless approved by council by supplemental appropriation.

"12. There shall be a monthly expenditure limit on all categories of welfare aid. This monthly expenditure limit shall be established by the department of public welfare at the time of presenting the budget, and shall take into account seasonal variations.

"FOR ANY MAN?

"13. Prior to certifying or continuing any more aid to dependent children cases, a determination shall be made as to the home environment. If the home environment is not satisfactory, the children in that home shall be placed in foster care in lieu of welfare aid to the family adults."

Anything unreasonable here—except to bums, cheats and deadbeats?

Guess again. At a hearing before a special investigating committee of the New York State Welfare Board in July, the investigators refused even to listen to Newburgh City Manager Mitchell's reasons for instituting reform.

Frankly, the social welfare racket is largely a racket to get votes.

Let's curtail its abuses before it strangles our free enterprise system.

Let's Maintain Our Military Strength as We Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, while world disarmament is an attractive ideal, the United States can make no move to weaken, in any way, our military

strength. We should, therefore, consider very carefully any new proposal that would create the impression that the United States will buy peace at any price. In this connection I call your attention to the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK: LAST THINGS FIRST

As the Communists throw a ring of steel around East Berlin, the last thing on the minds of most Americans, we imagine, is reducing U.S. military strength. Indeed, the multi-billion-dollar buildup of U.S. arms inspired by the threat to Berlin is in full swing.

And yet, in the midst of crisis and war fears, the best minds of the administration are turned to pleading for a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security. Recurring cold war crises, says Secretary of State Rusk, should not sink the United States into a slough of despond and "prevent us from addressing ourselves to the kind of world we hope to see." The country must be prepared for "new opportunities" that may arise from "the ebb of tension as a particular crisis passes."

No one can argue with a U.S. policy of seizing every opportunity that arises to ease tensions. But the proposed "department of peace" could not manufacture opportunity nor bring closer the distant goal of disarmament. At best, it is irrelevant; at worst, it could hamper U.S. ability to fulfill its hopes in the world.

For one thing, consider the responsibility the administration would lay upon well-intentioned but humanly limited men. Conceivably, the 250-man bureaucracy and its near-cabinet rank director might resign themselves to seeing their labors come to the same frustrating dead end as earlier planners. But, being human, they might be tempted to pursue their declared objective singlemindedly, spurred by pressures arising from the administration's commitment to a "new approach." Since new possibilities could be exploited only as past assumptions about the Soviets were reconsidered, the planners might find themselves bound to make the risky assumptions necessary to perfect their blueprint in order to justify themselves.

But the fundamental flaw in the administration's scheme is the assumption that past U.S. efforts to achieve disarmament have failed for lack of sufficient expertise. Implicit in the proposed gathering of experts is the idea that arms control is basically a technical problem.

This is manifestly untrue. While weapons technology and hence disarmament planning grow more complex, no U.S. plan has ever been rejected by the Soviets on the ground of technical inadequacy. A case in point is the elusive atomic test-ban treaty. Negotiations, now nearly 3 years old, have failed because the Soviets insist that any inspection system be politically determined; a mountain of scientific data is summarily swept aside by Moscow.

The truth is, the Communists are interested only in disarming their intended victims. The most brazen imperialists in history ask "total and complete" disarmament first, and talk of safeguards later. So long as the Communists and their ambitions remain unchanged, so long must freemen keep their heads clear.

We Americans especially must beware of the easy, habitual optimism that sometimes lures us into supposing our wishes will be fulfilled if we can just hit upon the right institutional device. Before we begin creating agencies rooted in our wishes about the world, the world must become quite a different place. And wishful thinking in the meantime only weakens our power to make it so.

Immediate Action Required To Save Small Dairymen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, for 3 years past the House Small Business Committee has been making extensive investigations into and studies of trade practices which are prevalent in the dairy industry and which are slowly but surely strangling all of the small dairymen who compete, in any way, with the large nationwide processors and distributors of dairy products.

Overwhelming evidence has been accumulated showing the appalling effect of price discrimination in the destruction of free competition and the creation of monopolies in the dairy industry. Investigations have disclosed that many of the dairy giants are selling milk and other dairy products at prices below cost, with resultant elimination of the small business competitors, at the same time that they are selling the same products at a much higher price in other areas of the country, thereby subsidizing their below-cost sales. Many small dairies have been forced out of business by such practices within a month or two after their inception. In some areas where nationwide distributors have gained monopoly control of prices, the public is paying more than it did for milk products before competition was eliminated.

One of my constituents, who is operating a small dairy in my district, has complained to the Small Business Committee with respect to these unfair trade practices. With leave to revise and extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD, the following letter addressed by my constituent to the Small Business Committee and referred to me because of my known great interest in the welfare of all the small businessmen whom I represent:

EDWARDSVILLE CREAMERY CO.,
Edwardsville, Ill., July 31, 1961.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: The National Independent Dairies Association executive vice president, D. C. Daniel, has requested that the following information be furnished to you:

1. In our immediate sales area the following independent dairies are no longer in business:

(a) Community Dairy, Alton, Ill., sold out about 5 years ago to Prairie Farms Creamery, Carlinville, Ill., a farmer-owned cooperative.

(b) Walnut Grove Dairy, Alton, Ill., sold out in 1960 to Prairie Farms Creamery, Carlinville, Ill.

(c) Granite City Dairy, Granite City, Ill., sold out to Massey Dairy, Inc., Granite City, Ill., about 1959.

(d) Massey Dairy, Inc., Granite City, Ill., quit business in 1961.

Six years ago there were 10 operating dairies in this area. Now there are only 6.

2. I don't know the number of independent dairies presently in business in Illinois but in my judgment at least 35 percent of those in business 10 years ago have been forced out of business.

3. The unfair trade practices which have been chiefly responsible for the liquidation of these businesses are predatory pricing arrangements at lower prices in Illinois than they have in Missouri by St. Louis based dairies.

4. Our own business has been hurt through loss of profits by these predatory pricing practices. Our sales volume has not been reduced in number of units sold but our dollar sales amount is lower than it should be because in many cases we have had to reduce our prices to meet those of our out-of-State competitors.

At the present time the major St. Louis dairies sell one-half gallons of milk in St. Louis for 37 cents delivered to detail stores while just across the Mississippi River in East St. Louis and Belleville, Ill., these same dairies have set a price of 32½ cents for the same product which they have continuously maintained. This amounts to 11½ percent below their St. Louis price.

5. We hope to continue in business with the help of our nonfluid-milk operations I don't believe that a dairy business could continue to operate in this area with only the processing of fluid milk products.

It is my sincere hope that your committee can help all independent business. We do not ask for special privileges but we do ask for elimination of unfair trade practices by the large dairy companies and by the small ones, too.

Yours very truly,

CLYDE W. FRUIT.

James A. Sheehan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the "Editor's Corner" of the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes on August 17, 1961:

JAMES A. SHEEHAN

James A. Sheehan, 68, died at Mount Alto Hospital in Washington, D.C., on August 9.

Jimmie, as he was known to his host of friends and well-wishers, retired as editor of the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes in May of 1960.

He first came to the Tribune as a service officer in 1934 and brought with him an extensive knowledge of veterans laws and regulations gained through years of work with the American Legion and later as national claims director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

From the post of a claims officer with this newspaper he was later named as associate editor and served in this capacity until he was advanced to acting editor after the sudden death of Editor Edward K. Inman in 1956. A year later he was appointed editor of the National Tribune and remained at that post until his retirement due to failing eyesight.

For his fellow veterans, Editor Sheehan had a sincere understanding of their many problems. He devoted countless hours to alleviating some of the trials and tribulations of those less fortunate than himself.

As editorial writer for the Tribune, Sheehan received a number of commendations from patriotic organizations and veteran groups and his forthright style and clarity of expression was highly appreciated by Tribune readers.

Born in St. Louis, Mo., Sheehan moved to New York City at an early age, after which he came to Washington to fill a Government post. Enlisting in the Army in 1917, Sheehan was sent overseas almost immediately. As an accomplished stenographer, he soon gravitated to the headquarters of the First Army when he became confidential secretary to Maj. Gen. Hugh Drum. Here, Jimmie saw at firsthand all of the important Allied military figures of the First World War. After the Armistice, Sheehan worked for a few years as a reporter for the Chicago Tribune in Paris and later became secretary to the American Ambassador to Czechoslovakia.

Returning to the United States, Jimmie worked as a claims officer for the American Legion under the direction of the late Watson B. Miller. Later, he transferred to the VFW as head of their claims department and in 1934, began his long period of service with the National Tribune.

His untimely departure brings sorrow and regret from his thousands of friends throughout the Nation. We join with them in mourning the loss of a trusted and valued friend and colleague.

Sheehan leaves a widow, Gertrude, of Washington, D.C.

One of the Results of Foreign Aid Not Included in the Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, before we authorize additional billions for foreign aid or vote to increase the power of the President to give away money, let us pause and review some of the probable results of our generosity as outlined in the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal:

ETERNAL TRIANGLE

For many years now, Uncle Sam has conducted his courtship of friendly and semi-friendly nations by reaching for his wallet whenever it appeared the country being wooed might be falling for the line of his rival. If this technique has not won him the impassioned affection of the recipients, it has at least—or so it is argued—kept most of the recipients from giving themselves to communism.

But because Washington is spending so much to keep so many countries happy, it runs the risk of jealousy popping up between states that are perfectly willing to accept American gifts but which get unhappy when each suspects the other of gaining special favor. For example, consider the mutual ire of India and Pakistan.

These countries, while living closer to each other than either prefers, have had a historic disagreement over the divided State of Kashmir, with each believing the other was about to make off with the whole. Pakistan's President recently visited the United States where he told us we must give his country more aid if the worst was to be avoided. America has already been sending

Pakistan, among other things, squadrons of supersonic jet fighters.

India, however, which has also been getting U.S. aid, fears Pakistan may use the U.S.-built planes to enforce its designs on Kashmir. Thus, there are indications that India wants to use a big part of its American aid, not for boosting its troubled economy, but for a fleet of jet planes to counter the air power of Pakistan.

This puts us in a position that any suitor would find a mite disturbing: Two sought-after companions in danger of using their patron's beneficence to throttle each other.

It's bad enough that Uncle Sam would be the loser no matter what the outcome of such a scrap. But it would be bitter indeed if his own generosity triggered the trouble.

"The ADA is the political action arm of the Fabian Socialist movement in the United States. This socialistic movement had its beginning in England in the late 19th century. Now, through duplicity and treachery, they intend to gain complete political control of the United States in order to promote their crackpot socialistic schemes. Naturally the American taxpayer is paying for—and will continue to pay for—this Utopian hayride."

"For example, back in the days of the ill-fated Communist-promoted Progressive Party—headed by Henry Wallace—many of the present-day Fabian Socialists worked hand-in-glove with the Reds in this Marxian political venture.

BUT MEAN NO

"During this honeymoon period between the Reds and Fabians, I was a member of the political commission of the Communist Party. One of my Red party assignments in those days (1947-48) was to meet with these starry-eyed ADA daydreamers in secret Progressive Party meetings to plan strategy.

"Talks with the ADAers convinced me that somehow they had the silly idea that they were using the Reds to help further their Fabian socialistic program in America.

"The Red agents with whom I worked—and who were familiar with this gullible attitude of the Fabian Socialists—laughed loud and long at these intellectual snobs. The Reds had only one ultimate plan for them. That plan called for the complete annihilation of these Utopian scatter-brains—if their coalition was successful in taking over the Government.

IT'S OUR GUESS

"Whether the Fabian Socialists who are beating the drums for the Kremlin line on Red China are aware of it or not, the Kremlin's plan still stands for them as it has for the past 44 years. And that is to hang them or stand them before a firing squad.

"The second part of this Kremlin directive in getting non-Communists to work for Kremlin objectives was never read to the naive and gullible fools:

"Comrades, after we take over the government with this united front, our next task will be to liquidate (murder) the rest of the coalition—and take over the government ourselves.

"These words right from the mouths of the Communist leaders certainly should serve as a warning to all ADA'ers, liberals, progressives, do-gooders, and all others who think that—by working for Red objectives—they can save their own skins in case the Reds ever take over.

"Far from saving themselves with this role of fence sitting and dual loyalty—by aiding the Kremlin and the Communist plot to take over our Nation—they are insuring their own ultimate destruction at the hands of the treacherous Red gangsters."

THEY GOTTA GO

The man you heard from today is one of the most knowledgeable concerning the machinations of the Communist Party in the United States.

Matt Cvetic sacrificed even the love of his family and those nearest and dearest to him in order to go underground to get the necessary facts for the FBI.

He deserves the thanks of a grateful nation.

His recent appearance on Ralph Storey's popular "Storey Line" on Hollywood Radio Station KNX brought him an avalanche of mail.

I wish Matt had a regular program of his own to give us the benefit of what he learned about the comrades as a counterspy for the FBI.

**A Propaganda Gain for the United States
on Test-Ban Talk**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article entitled "United States Scores Propaganda Gain by Insisting on Test-Ban Talk," written by William R. Frye and published in the Minneapolis Tribune of July 23, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**U.S. SCORES PROPAGANDA GAIN BY INSISTING
ON TEST-BAN TALK**

(By William R. Frye)

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND.—For once, the United States has Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev over a propaganda barrel—and not on something trivial, but on a major issue which stirs the emotions of hundreds of people.

That issue is nuclear-weapons testing. People in Asia and Africa who couldn't possibly care less what happens to Berlin or Laos care very much indeed whether their air, their rivers and their food crops are poisoned by radioactive fallout.

And Khrushchev today stands as the road-block to a ban on atomic testing. That fact, long apparent to Americans, can now be brought home to the uncommitted world with the impact of a piledriver.

The first step toward exploitation of this rare opportunity was taken this past week when Washington and London put atomic testing on the provisional agenda of the September U.N. General Assembly.

Western diplomats here hope the United States and Britain will follow through with imagination and skill, and really rip the hide off the Kremlin this time.

A whole year of patient effort has been invested here in Geneva by an incredibly long-suffering team of American and British officials to bring about this opportunity. Khrushchev lost interest in a test ban as early as May 1960, but the West had to keep trying in order to prove it to the world.

The West wants a test-ban treaty; Khrushchev does not want one,

The West wants a minimum amount of control; Khrushchev wants self-inspection and a three-way veto over that.

The West has made a series of dramatic concessions this year; Khrushchev has moved backward, Welching on agreements previously reached.

The West is willing to sign a treaty outlawing tests and only tests; Khrushchev wants to bury the test ban in a maze of negotiations on general and complete disarmament.

It adds up to a case of Soviet sabotage so clear that no one from Stockholm to Jakarta or from Tokyo to Accra could possibly miss it once it is pointed out and documented.

If Khrushchev takes the licking he deserves on the test ban, he will be taking it in considerable part on behalf of the Chinese. Presumably it is because the Chinese Reds want to test, and because he does not want the world to know he cannot prevent it, that Khrushchev has reversed himself on the ban.

The more severe the propaganda licking, the more reason Khrushchev will have to resent Chinese policy. The more it hurts Khrushchev to have pulled China's chest-

nuts out of the first, the more angry he will be at having had to do so.

He might well put pressure—highly unwelcome pressure—on China to reverse its policy. The West, therefore, has an opportunity to intensify Sino-Soviet antagonism.

A smashing propaganda victory could serve the U.S. national interest in still another way. If it ultimately were to be decided that new American test programs would benefit American weapons technology more than new Soviet testing would benefit Soviet technology, then the resulting decision to resume testing would be less severely condemned by world opinion if it first were clearly established that Russia had sabotaged a treaty.

This fact, however, introduces a complication. If the United States seems to the world to have this motive, the purpose will be defeated.

Semyon K. Tsarapkin, Russia's man here, is screaming from the housetops that the United States wants a "propaganda cushion" for a test resumption. There is, it is privately acknowledged, a certain amount of truth to the charge, and until the United States ceases to be vulnerable to this counterattack, it will not be able to take full advantage of Khrushchev's position.

It is not now U.S. policy to bang, at least not first, and it is by no means clear that it ever will be. The prevailing judgment in nonmilitary circles, and even in some military circles, is that on balance, Russia would gain more than the United States from such resumption. If so, diplomats here believe President Kennedy should make the American policy of abstention unmistakably clear, and thus spike Tsarapkin's guns.

Query: Have the Russians been secretly testing? No one to whom I have spoken knows of any evidence that they have, and many doubt that they could gain any really significant advantage from doing so, given all the circumstances.

Query: Could the United States score a breakthrough in antimissile defense, or in development of the neutron bomb, by banging? Perhaps, but so might the Russians—and the United States is presumed to be ahead in this field now. Weaponneering goes on in the laboratory whether tests are conducted or not.

The conclusion here is that the United States should take a clear position against testing by anyone anywhere, and from this platform of virtue should have a field day in the U.N. General Assembly with Khrushchev's clear position on the other side of the tracks.

Let's Have Some Facts About Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable thought and discussion taking place today throughout the United States and the world with respect to the Peace Corps program.

The El Capitan Citizen, of Santee, Calif., which is located within my congressional district, published an editorial on August 10, 1961, entitled "Let's Have Some Facts About Peace Corps," which is significant to this issue, and under unanimous consent I include it herewith as a part of my remarks.

LET'S HAVE SOME FACTS ABOUT PEACE CORPS

A few months ago, R. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, explained why he is working night and day to make a success of his job.

It may be trite, but he started out explaining these are urgent times. "In the world struggle we have relatively little time left," he said, and then continued to give an example:

"Just a few days ago, the former President of Costa Rica sat in the chair over there and told me there are 40 Moscow-trained agents of world revolution in Costa Rica alone. Red China, even though it is now under great economic stress, has invited all members of the Costa Rican legislature to visit Red China with all expenses paid. We have practically nobody taking that kind of interest in Costa Rica."

Shriver then drove home his point with the following quotation:

"Anybody who believes in the dignity of man and who has any kind of information on what is going on in the world just can't sit still today."

"Or look at it this way. Fourteen years from now my older boy will be 21 years old. Somewhere around then it will occur to him to ask his father: What were you doing in those crucial years of 1961 and 1962? What will I be able to say for myself? That I was a member of the XYZ country club and shot golf in the seventies?"

These are brave words by the leader of the Peace Corps, but what about his actions. Is he really following the current trend of stirring official words and not-so-stirring official acts?

"In Washington," says U.S. News & World Report, "concern is felt on Capitol Hill over a number of factors. Some Congressmen question whether a Peace Corps really is necessary, whether the massive expensive effort to put a handful of semi-skilled young people into the field is warranted."

These Congressmen particularly question this in view of the fact that such services are being rendered by hundreds of older and more experienced organizations."

The Richmond (Va.) News Leader insists that the corps is a cropper and a fizzle because the basic idea of the Peace Corps has been altered and that many of the present problems should have been "foreseen by R. Sargent Shriver when he did his task force report on the possibility of such a venture."

The newspaper continues to point out that, "private groups and organizations—missionaries, 4-H clubs, university programs, international charities, and others—are already doing much of the work that the Peace Corps mapped out for itself. These groups have put many more people into the world's needy areas than the Government's plan could ever do. These units have stability and a sense of purpose that is defined in each case."

"Already missionaries complain that they are expected to pay higher prices for many things they use or eat since the Peace Corps project was announced. The natives are anxious to cash in on anything financed by our fairy-godmother Government."

For instance, Peace Corps members going into Colombia this fall, will receive some \$150 per month in living subsistence while living native. This is more than the average Colombian worker beside him will receive for a full year to support his family. In addition, the corpsman receives some \$300 more per month in pay in other benefits, and this amount can be increased by Presidential fiat, whim or decree according to Senate bill 2000 or perhaps even without the Senate bill.

Shriver estimates it will cost \$9,000 per year to keep one corpsman in the field. Of this he admits some \$3,000 per year will go to administrators here in the States—many of which are tagged for \$19,000 to \$20,000 salaries.

A spokesman for the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society said a single man can be trained and maintained (as a Baptist missionary) for \$3,500 for the first year, plus 20 percent overhead, and for only \$2,000 the second year, plus the 20 percent overhead.

The Methodist Board of Missions trains and maintains a couple for 1 year for about \$10,000. Overseas, full support amounts to \$7,500 for a couple.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY says the Catholic Church is training and supporting volunteers in Colombia and other Latin American countries at a total cost of \$2,860 for a 3-year hitch.

According to the U.S. News & World Report, Latin Americans are looking askance at the "idealistic amateurs" when they so badly need professional and technical help. Yet they would rather not be put on the spot or refusing "awkward but humanitarian" assistance offered by the American President.

Many people are asking why the corpsmen are given a mere 6 months training to go out against Communists with 20 or 30 years in the field. Others think the members should take a loyalty oath to the United States. Still others think that all members should at least complete their present college courses before dashing off to save another part of the world. But in the main, most Americans hope desperately that all these criticisms of the Corps are not true.

The Peace Corps has caught the imagination of the country. It is a public relations stunt par excellance. If there is any possibility that it can be out on a workable basis, few Americans are going to buck it. But all information coming out of Washington seems to indicate grave problems.

Perhaps, the worst part of all this is the extent to which future Americans will look to the Government to perform the charitable acts already now being performed by private agencies. We must never forget that churches, universities, 4-H groups, and privately financed groups are already providing technical assistance to backward countries, as well as maintaining hospitals, schools, orphanages, even technical training programs to help the natives help themselves. Why should the Government force the taxpayers to support something that private industry and private enterprise is already doing overseas?

Remember, whenever any of these private people goof up, it is only a reflection on that person or his sponsoring group. But when a corpsman pulls a boner, it is blamed on the Government of the United States. And even before they have been sent into the field, Tanganyika propagandists are denouncing the Peace Corps as spies.

How much better would it have been if President Kennedy had called in the leaders of all private groups working in foreign areas and given them high praise. His words sent out to all the Nation's news media would have been the catalyst that could have precipitated a new rush of volunteers to these organizations. These organizations do not take money out of taxpayers pockets. These groups screen their applicants. And most of all, these organizations are doing far more in other countries than can ever be accomplished by the semiskilled volunteers of the Peace Corps.

Only One More Bureau?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1961

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, if we could dispense with two worthless and

inactive Government bureaus for every new one proposed, I think we would be progressing in the right direction.

The Poughkeepsie Journal, of the same address, very aptly summarizes one of the more recent proposals as an expensive and meddlesome measure, and I am glad to submit a copy of their editorial herewith:

ONE MORE BUREAU

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, has decided that what the country needs is another bureau with almost a quarter of a billion deficit dollars to spend.

In his bill (S. 1212) Senator CLARK proposes to establish a Redevelopment Area Industrial Mortgage Corp. to create a market in the industrial mortgages of depressed area plants. All this is to take place in an independent bureau which has no connection with the Department of Commerce, and therefore no connection with the administration of the Depressed Areas Act already passed.

It is to be modeled after the Federal National Mortgage Association, which was supposed to do the same thing with home mortgages, but never was able to create much of a market. Fanny May (as it's known in financial circles) was never able to unload but about a fourth of all the mortgages it bought, and the revolving fund hardly turns over at all.

When many of the redevelopment areas are paying for advertising in business magazines to inform industries that "financing is available on very favorable terms," it is hard to see why the Federal Government should meddle further with capitalizing the free enterprise system.

There are other serious objections. The Depressed Areas Act has an antipiracy clause designed to prevent the use of U.S. funds for the purpose of moving existing plants from one community to another and thus relocating unemployment rather than creating jobs. The Clark bill has no such safeguard.

The bureau would be permanent, and so outlast any crisis it is supposed to deal with.

The RFC scandals demonstrated the dangers of favoritism, corruption, and influence peddling inherent in making Federal funds available for such purposes.

Hearings on this little-known but expensive and meddlesome bill already have begun, and observers fear that in the flurries over spacemen and Berlin Congress may pass it absentmindedly with little discussion.

Minutemen Support House Joint Resolution 447 in War Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, each and every time this Nation has found itself in a perilous situation or actually in a war, it has always been the American citizen who has pulled this country up by the bootstraps and met the challenge head on.

On June 12, I introduced in the House, House Joint Resolution 447 calling for a declaration of war against the 98 Communist Parties of the world.

Almost immediately, thousands of ordinary citizens throughout the country offered their help in support of this reso-

lution. Lt. Col. Frederick A. Kibbe, USAR, retired, and Mr. Douglas R. Voorhees, of Fort Lauderdale and Miami, Fla., respectively, are outstanding examples of the courageous attitude being taken by so many of our citizens in these perilous times. Colonel Kibbe and Mr. Voorhees, both members of the Florida Minutemen, organized a drive to have House Joint Resolution 447 printed in a number of Florida newspapers in order that other citizens might be made aware of the imminence of the Communist threat.

To date, the Florida Minutemen have been successful in having the resolution published in five Florida dailies with an aggregate circulation of over one-half million. In addition, the Minutemen have published and distributed more than 8,000 reprints of the House Joint Resolution 447 to various schools, groups, and individuals.

I wish to extend my sincere appreciation to these loyal Americans who are helping other citizens to transform their feelings, convictions, and patriotic desires into effective action.

Colonel Kibbe and Mr. Voorhees are to be highly commended for their unselfish devotion to the task of awakening the people of this Nation to the fact that we are at war with the international Communist conspiracy.

The Fulbright Fixation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would call to the attention of my colleagues a recent article by Mr. Henry J. Taylor, which appeared in the Washington Daily News. The article, entitled "The Fulbright Fixation" follows:

If we are to know what is happening to us we have to know that fixations do grip relatively unknown men whose influence on our country is enormous. Consider the idea that America must not defend herself any place on her own—which was at the root of the Cuban debacle. In short, our so-called collective security.

That fixation is typified by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and he is as wrong as a summer oyster. But ideas can get into men's mind and all circumstances and history does not seem able to blow them out. They just think something and that is all there is to it.

Because Senator FULBRIGHT is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee he effects promotions within the State Department, its congressional relations and budget prospects and, thus, most importantly, America's policies not alone through the committee's statutory authority but merely on the basis of his own thinking.

We do not have collective security. We have collective insecurity. We are wise to be attached firmly to the principle. Often it is indispensable, as in NATO. But there is no NATO in Latin America, for example, and depending on collectivity wherever this involves numerous weak and shaky countries means we flounder into exactly what happened in Cuba.

Senator FULBRIGHT opposed any kind of intervention there unless we could waltz in

with a whole group of Latin American States, as if our Nation could order such a tidy state of affairs.

Many much more knowing, practical and tested observers than Senator FULBRIGHT find we are not blamed in Latin America for the intervention but, instead, for allowing the intervention to fail.

We got slight, if any, credit for our Government's self-defined morals in nonintervention, even within the Organization of American States. For all grows worse by our remedy. Everywhere southward most of our neighbors realized that both under the benefits to them of the Monroe Doctrine and because of Castro's relentless and psychopathic provocations an intervention was completely justified on moral or any other grounds. And is it, in truth, really moral not to intervene in a murder unless you can locate your cousins to walk with you? Or if you have no cousins, to turn your back?

There is widespread conviction the United States failed to intervene openly in Cuba, not for a moral reason, but because our Government feared that this would provoke war between the powerful Soviet Union and the United States.

Countless millions throughout Latin America who love freedom would have welcomed U.S. intervention in Cuba (and still would) because they fear the expansion of Castroism into their homelands and doubt it will be stopped without intervention. These millions cannot dream in Senator FULBRIGHT's office and telephone thunderbolts to the State Department. They have to live (or die) with what they get. Their only test of the intervention is that it succeed; and when it did not they are the victims in all the shame and despair of this sickening tragedy along with the entire free world.

How could America conceivably "lose more in other countries," in Latin America or anywhere, than we lost by the effect of this debacle on Khrushchev's estimate of the United States? Isn't Russia a country? The result there alone can mistakenly rationalize Russia into such pressure on us that, God forbid, there is a war. Meanwhile, our no-matter-what nonintervention policy frees Soviet strategy to pillage like a leopard turned from the cage.

Senator FULBRIGHT can sit frozen by his fixation and wrap a moral toga around himself if he prefers, but it does not fit. When the Cuban intervention design was allowed to be so disastrously frail to conform to our policy—and even then the dribble that was laid on for this was drawn back halfway our country suffered a disaster far, far greater than Pearl Harbor. We knew how to tighten our belts and, like Americans, fight our way back from that. But we do not know how to fight our way back from this.

Much Discussed Secret Memorandum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, George Todt, a columnist for the Los Angeles Herald Express, has always been willing to discuss basic issues confronting our country with refreshing candor. The much discussed secret memorandum sent to the Pentagon from Capitol Hill has, in the opinion of many, seriously curtailed the ability of many of our

best Generals and others to train our troops to meet the challenges of psychological warfare. The ideological battle that we face as a nation cannot be underestimated. In his column of August 14, 1961, Mr. Todt discusses this highly controversial memorandum with a sense of positive realism. Thinking that Members of Congress will want to read Mr. Todt's column, under unanimous consent I include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"It is probably the view of most Members of Congress today that if foreign aid were laid before the people in a referendum, it would be defeated."—SENATOR J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, secret memorandum to the Pentagon.

The highly controversial secret memorandum—that was quickly leaked out to concerned Senators on Capitol Hill—of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT to the Pentagon is no longer secret.

After considerable prodding, and cognizant of the storm of controversy, even a national sense of outrage has antimilitary sentiments had evolved. FULBRIGHT revealed it to the Senate on August 2 despite earlier pleadings that he could not locate a copy.

Not only the erstwhile secret memorandum, but also FULBRIGHT's thinking and supporting documents—in short, his case—is fully presented on pages 13436–13443 of the August 2 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Every patriotic American—in or out of the uniform of our country—ought to read the Fulbright memorandum.

WAY WE THINK

The Arkansas Senator, a former Rhodes scholar from Oxford, points up the real struggle in this Nation better than he may have guessed. It is not basically Republicans versus Democrats. Actually, our fight is ideological instead of political in nature, and it lies between the conservative Americans whose constitutional tenets spring from the Founding Fathers and our cherished War of Independence in 1776, and the radical liberals whose ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) philosophy is liberally sprinkled with British Fabian socialism and Russian menshevism—the minority section of the Social Revolutionary Party which escaped Lenin's clutches when his Bolsheviks took power in 1917.

None of these socialistic groups are Communist, but their end objectives tend to head in much the same Marxian direction.

Some day the American people are going to learn that the real, basic ideological war in the United States today lies fundamentally between those whose differing philosophies emanate from (1) the American Revolution (conservatives) and (2) the Marxist one (radical liberals).

CHARTS OUR LIFE

They are simply not two slightly differing chips off the same block.

We are going to have to stand up and be counted soon.

Maybe the forthcoming nationwide elections in 1962 will provide a new criterion for us.

If the American public, which lives in this great citadel of freedom, the United States, is not fit to be trusted with its own alerted thinking in the continuing battle against totalitarian, dictatorial communism—then perhaps Senator FULBRIGHT is right. Although I, for one, will not accept it.

In fairness to the Arkansas solon, I hope my readers will obtain the August 2 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read his words carefully for their own considered judgment. Here are a few random excerpts from his once-secret memorandum to whet your appetite:

TO FORGE A LINK

"The American people have never been tested in such a struggle (i.e., anticomunism). In the long run, it is quite possible that the principal problem of leadership will be, if it is not already, to restrain the desire of the people to hit the Communists with everything we've got, particularly if there are more Cubas and Laos. Pride in victory, and frustration in restraint, during the Korean war, led to MacArthur's revolt and McCarthyism.

"If the military is infected with this virus of rightwing radicalism, the danger is worthy of attention. If it believes the public is, the danger is enhanced.

"There is little in the education, training, or experience of most military officers to equip them with the balance of judgment necessary to put their own ultimate solutions—those with which their education, training, and experience are concerned—into proper perspective in the President's total 'strategy for the nuclear age.'

"Fundamentally, it is believed that the American people have little, if any, need to be alerted to the menace of the cold war."

OF PEACE OR STRIFE

Actually, our military officers have been operating under a tough-minded 1958 directive of the National Security Council. It decreed that the military should be used to reinforce our cold war ideological effort.

A former U.S. Army general was behind that one: Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Now FULBRIGHT—who helped nix the employment of our jets in the Cuban fiasco recently—wants to get into the act. Can he help us? Or hurt us?

Freshening Political Winds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of August 16, 1961, carried an editorial well worth reading and I recommend it to Republican and Democratic Members alike. Under unanimous consent, I insert the same in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FRESHENING POLITICAL WINDS

Some people assumed as a matter of course that the Republican Party would turn more liberal after losing the White House last November. After all, it was argued, that's what the people said they wanted, wasn't it?

But it isn't working out that way, so far at least. As Mr. Novak recently reported in this newspaper, the GOP is gradually turning more conservative. Senator GOLDWATER has achieved a remarkable prominence, but he is only the most dramatic example of the current conservative trend within the party and its representatives in Congress.

One explanation is simply that the Kennedy spending program is too much too soon; it was bound to generate opposition. The monstrous grab-bag housing bill, for example, was enough to prick the conscience not only of a conservative but of some liberal Republicans, who voted against it.

The far more significant explanation, though, is that the Members of Congress are feeling the heat from home. Local party workers tell of increasingly conservative voter sentiment, and the lawmakers also

hear it directly from their constituents. As one party pro put it, "You go around the country and you hear two things from Republicans: They want a tough foreign policy and they want a cut in Government spending."

It should be noted in passing that a "tough foreign policy" is not necessarily "conservative." Everyone, regardless of label, was appalled at the Cuban debacle, and almost everyone backs a tough stand on Berlin. It is, if anything, a matter of degree; as a generalization, conservatives, by the nature of their creed, are the stanchest opponents of communism, but that doesn't mean they want to go to war at the drop of every hat.

The domestic spending issue, at any rate, divides conservatives and liberals far more sharply. Indeed it must, for this issue is one of the outward signs of the clash of the rival political philosophies. On the one hand are the liberals, who believe the central Government must do almost everything for the citizen, regardless of the cost in taxes, debt, inflation, and infringements on personal liberty. On the other are the conservatives, who believe the individual, and hence society, fares best in an atmosphere of maximum freedom consistent with order.

So it is a good thing that the spending issue is getting hot, for it serves to put the deeper rivalry in clearer focus. The Kennedy administration refuses to make any cuts in nonessential spending to offset its drastic increases in defense outlays, but instead seeks to spend more on more things. It thus has put the country on notice of its heavy bias toward centralized Government power.

The Republicans, in these circumstances, have an excellent opportunity to make the case for freedom, with next year's congressional elections as the first target. They could show concretely what a sharply lower level of Government spending would mean in terms of lower taxes, revived initiative, economic growth, and generally a fresher climate in the country.

This swelling of conservative opinion, even as it is, indicates that the voters might not be unresponsive to such a campaign. The people, after all, did not say last November that they wanted a Government of reckless spenders; half of them voted for the more conservative alternative.

And behind that result, we think, lies a restiveness growing over the years. People have been getting fed up with a point of political view which has no new ideas but only a compulsion to spend and control. The liberal approach, whether called New Deal, Fair Deal, or New Frontier, is old and tired. The conservative case—or at any rate, the case for freedom—is by contrast young and vigorous.

Whether the Republicans will make use of their opportunity is another matter. They have missed other such bets in the past, and lost elections. But it is encouraging for the political vitality of this country that more and more Republicans at least acknowledge the existence of the opportunity.

New Frontier Policies Not Compatible With Private Business Enterprises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, those businessmen who had fond hopes that the New Frontier might be friendlier to

private enterprise than were the New Deal and the Fair Deal, have had those hopes shattered by the increasing demands of the administration for new welfare programs, greater Federal participation in business and ever-increasing Federal spending. The attitude of the administration toward business is pointed out in the following article from the Wall Street Journal. In my opinion, the best way to protect our free enterprise system and give private initiative the incentive to make its fullest contribution to our society is to enact legislation to prohibit the Federal Government from engaging in business in competition to private enterprise. My resolution, House Resolution 138, would accomplish this purpose by making it unconstitutional for the Government to be in business in competition with its own citizens:

ANTIBUSINESS AURA—ADMINISTRATION ASSAULTS MEAN BRIEF HONEYMOON IS OVER

(By John A. Grimes)

WASHINGTON.—Soon after he took the oath as Chief Executive, President Kennedy was assuring an approving group of businessmen that Government and business were "necessary allies" rather than "natural enemies."

Now, just a scant 6 months later, the trend points more to enmity than alliance. As the evidence piles up, it is all but extinguishing early business hopes that here at last was a Democratic administration it could along with.

The strains are many:

Chairman Minow of the Federal Communications Commission blackened television programming as a "vast wasteland." This threat of even closer Government supervision so aroused the industry that it rose up to help stymie legislation that would have given the FCC chief more power.

The administration is pressing a proposal to add electrical generating facilities to a nuclear reactor at Hanford, Wash., that sends currents of fear through private power proponents. The Hanford addition not only would deprive private utilities of business in the Northwest, they contend, but could signal the start of large-scale Federal public power projects using atomic energy. Shudders one opponent: It "could easily let down the flood-gates to a whole new round of Federal encroachment in the power field."

PLAYING MATCHMAKER

Chairman Boyd of the Civil Aeronautics Board makes no secret of his dismay at leaving airline mergers to what he calls the "vagaries of the marketplace." Instead, he wants the Board to play matchmaker. Already, Northeast and Eastern are nudged closer together, though neither airline has expressed any enthusiasm for marrying.

Attorney General Kennedy, pointing to the price-fixing scandals in the electrical equipment industry, accuses the business community of "moral laxity." His trustbusters not only track other price-fixing scents, but figuring the climate is right, aim at carving up corporate giants. General Motors, General Electric, and American Telephone & Telegraph all are in their sights.

Commerce Secretary Hodges, himself a former corporate official, talked up the national shock induced by the electrical price-fixing disclosures and put a group to work writing a federally sponsored business code of ethics—a plain implication that business can't be trusted to look after its own morality.

Chairman-designate Swidler of the Federal Power Commission promises that his agency, depicted as being industry-minded under the Eisenhower administration, now will become consumer-minded. And natural gas com-

panies tremble at the thought of what this could mean. One omen: Mr. Swidler says the agency will break new ground by reducing rates it thinks too high, even though there's no complaint.

Even Mr. Kennedy, despite his proffers of friendship, has joined in the stone-throwing. Proposing a code of improved conduct for Government employees, the President blamed "widespread business conspiracies to fix prices" and "cheating on expense accounts" for debasing the Nation's morals.

To be sure, the trend is not all one way. The administration is making a special effort to hand development of a communications satellite system to private industry, instead of marking it off as another area of Government monopoly. But clear notice has been given that this concession will be protected "in the public interest" by strict Federal regulation.

It's also true that the administration offered its first tax cut to business. But the form, an investment credit plan, provoked vigorous protest from businessmen who argue that a more rapid depreciation allowance is a much more feasible way to handle the tax relief. Too, Mr. Kennedy coupled his proposal with various others to spank business for what he described as abusing the tax laws. Example of the Kennedy chastisement: "It's deductible" is a business slogan that must be erased from the language.

COOLER CLIMATE

In sum, then, it takes no unusually sensitive thermometer to determine that as the sticky midsummer heat settles on Washington the political climate for business has turned noticeably cooler. One business lobbyist on Capitol Hill, whose job it is to detect which way the political winds are blowing, confides: "I'm telling my clients to look carefully over legislation they don't like, decide what they can live with—and accept that."

Why the change from handshake to fist? Certainly the administration will deny there has been a change. Far from being "anti-business," officials will insist they would like nothing better than to forge an alliance. They will defend each and every one of their programs as being dedicated to promoting the "public interest"—pure and simple. And, if one accepts their logic, this dedication may seem entirely genuine.

There's little doubt that some of the areas now receiving closer Government scrutiny deserve it. Mr. Minow's criticism of the television industry surely is welcomed by many viewers. Nor can it be argued that the laws against price-fixing and monopoly shouldn't be enforced to protect the public. And no one supposes that business morality is lily-white in every instance.

But the glittering nobility of each of these causes can easily blind the casual observer to an even greater cause that must be considered: The Nation's still-strong conservative bent remains a chief bar to Mr. Kennedy's ability to move the country in the liberal direction he desires; and the corporate world stands as the major exponent of this conservatism.

The closeness of the 1960 election, the President's caution in pushing liberal legislation, and Mr. Kennedy's lip service, if nothing more yet, to fiscal responsibility—these indicate clearly the existence of a powerful conservative influence which administration planners are taking special care to erode rather than arouse; for much of what the administration wants to do, the argument is made that the country "is not yet ready."

The fact that business is not entirely ready for Mr. Kennedy is clear after only a quick glance at what's been happening on Capitol Hill. Business groups spent more than a month battering the President's first attempt at tax reform and can be expected

to put even more vigor into the fight against some aspects of his proposed broader tax revision program next year. Business groups are giving strong backing to efforts to beat down the administration's expanded foreign aid program. They are in the forefront of critics of Mr. Kennedy's aid to education proposal. And business has become increasingly vocal as each new plan for Federal spending is unveiled before Congress.

It thus makes sense for Mr. Kennedy to seek a way to neutralize the conservative political influence business is bringing to bear against his program. To shrink business' political influence, the Kennedy team found ready for exploitation events that already had damaged business' public prestige, chiefly the electrical equipment industry price-fixing scandals. Now, in the name of the "public interest," that prestige is taking a further battering.

GROWING ESTRANGEMENT

In part, this growing estrangement between business and the Kennedy Democrats might be attributed to unfamiliarity. The New Frontier is populated with young men whose meteoric careers have brought them in contact with little else but the academic and governmental. Certainly Mr. Kennedy does not regard the predominantly Republican business community as fertile territory for the "idea men" he seeks to collect around him.

But, whether by design or inexperience, the fact remains that the administration has done far more to alienate than to understand business. Perhaps the most dramatic proof is the complete rupture between the administration and the Business Advisory Council, which not only had advised the Commerce Department since New Deal days but had served as a talent reservoir for many administrations. And, there were no tears at the parting—either by the Kennedy team or the blue-ribbon group of corporate executives.

And relations between business and the administration threaten to become even more difficult. For though the Kennedy Democrats show little enthusiasm for the business viewpoint on governmental affairs, the administration's eagerness to influence the affairs of business remains unabated.

Take Mr. Kennedy's Labor-Management Council, for example. It is freely feared by corporate executives and others that the Council is intended to be nothing more than a device for the Federal Government to establish wage and price policies for industry to follow. Labor Secretary Goldberg has strongly indicated that the Government will force, if necessary, an auto industry settlement to avoid a strike; such as a walkout, Mr. Goldberg has declared, would not be "in the national interest."

Anticipating a possible autumn increase in steel prices, Mr. Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers is peering at the industry with skeptical eyes; it is probable that, with the administration's desire to "hold the price line," a price increase on this basic commodity would push the steel companies into a difficult public relations position.

True, the administration does not yet have any legal mechanism to prevent unions from striking, or steel companies from boosting prices. But the pressure of administration censure, coming at a time when business prestige has been kept in low estate, would make it extremely difficult for industry to hold to a firm position.

Just after Mr. Kennedy uttered his friendly postinaugural words, a top businessman commented that "we liked what we heard," and the proposed alliance seemed entirely feasible. But in the wake of developing events, businessmen may wonder if they can expect even a peaceful coexistence.

A Few of the Dangers of Free Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, George Todt's column in the August 11, 1961, issue of the Los Angeles Herald Express reviews some of the dangers of free trade to our domestic industries. I think every Member of Congress should have an opportunity to read the column. Under unanimous consent, I insert the column in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TIDDLYWINK WAR (By George Todt)

"Commerce is the equalizer of the wealth of nations."—GLADSTONE.

International free trade can be made to sound by its exponents like a panacea for many of the ills which now plague the world—but how can our U.S. industries compete on a reasonable or fair basis with foreign competitors which utilize cheap labor paid near-starvation wages?

I asked this question of affable Terry Sanford, the new Democratic Governor of North Carolina—who succeeded Luther Hodges, presently Secretary of Commerce in the Kennedy administration—as we toured the Warner Brothers movie lot together in Burbank recently.

Terry is 43, one of the youngest Governors in the Nation, a former paratroop officer in the European theater during World War II. He received a battlefield promotion to first lieutenant during the Battle of the Bulge. Fought in five campaigns. Has a good head on his shoulders. Strictly regular.

WHAT IS RIGHT

The Governor answered by question thusly:

"The problem of free trade is a very difficult and controversial one. There is no easy answer to the long haul effect of it. Things become quite complicated when you go beneath the surface. Let's kick the ball around a bit.

"For example, consider our ally Japan. If the Japanese textile industry cannot sell its surplus goods here in the United States—then perhaps it would, of necessity, be forced to trade with Red China instead.

"So we provide markets here for the Japanese to sell their goods—and it hurts considerably our own textile industries in the United States. The foreign workers are paid such substandard wages in comparison to ours that their costs are often much lower than ours, even allowing for additional oversea transportation charges.

"Wisely, the Japanese have imposed on themselves a voluntary quota of textile goods to be sent here to the United States. It may be that we will have to resort to a system of quotas in the future on many other items, too."

CAN'T BE WRONG

Afterward we got into question of trade with Red China—accomplished surreptitiously through the British port of Hong Kong.

This is a horse of a different color to Terry and me.

It does not make sense to be engaged in an intolerably expensive global cold war—or a recent hot one in Korea—with Red China and supply some of her critical needs

through the back door of Hong Kong trade and commerce.

"Hong Kong cotton goods, undoubtedly using Red Chinese textiles—produced with slave labor by undemocratic Communist despots—are now undercutting our own American made textiles in the domestic market," Terry Sanford told me. "We pay labor 10 times the rate prevalent in Hong Kong. While we think competition is a good thing ordinarily and within reason, it cannot remain unlimited without damaging extensively our own industries."

DAY OR NIGHT

Actually, I think it is time for us to get down to brass tacks with our British cousins. Undoubtedly, they have a trade problem—and we all wish them the best in their efforts to increase their commerce.

However, we are going to have to stop aiding and abetting our mutual Communist enemy in trading under any circumstances. Cold war strategy demands it. It is patently ridiculous for us to spend hundreds of billions of our dollars to bring pressure to bear on the Red enemy—only to have our allies supply his needs when the pressure gets critical.

Either we are in a war, or we are not. If we are, we ought to try to win it. We cannot win by bailing out the enemy when he begins to hurt.

Is it not time to stop playing tiddlywink?

After exploring some of the serious problems of our world with Terry, he also let me in on the reason he came to California.

THAT'S OUR SONG

Seems North Carolina has great plans for a giant 9-day trade fair to be held in Charlotte, N.C., commencing October 12, which is Columbus Day.

The fair will be inaugurated by President John F. Kennedy, himself.

Besides extending a cordial invitation to California industries to send their exhibits to the North Carolina trade fair—Terry also let it be known that his productive State will welcome any California industry which might like to locate another branch or factory elsewhere. A real live wire.

Kennedy Has Fingers in Too Many Pies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe our colleagues will be interested in the remarks found in an article by Mr. Richard Starnes, which appeared in the Washington Daily News. The article entitled "Kennedy Has Fingers in Too Many Pies," is as follows:

The blowzy near technicians who practice the black arts of image making are doing a major disservice to the President.

The Chief Executive of the United States is not a policeman, nor a labor mediator, nor a news agency, nor any other Jack-Kennedy-of-all-trades. Yet, in the frenetic battle to keep his "image" in the forefront of public consciousness, the President has been repeatedly cast in these roles.

In New York, for example, the Metropolitan Opera recently endured another of its perennial labor crises.

The opera company using techniques that would have drawn howls of outrage if they had been employed by an industrial concern, simply told its musicians it would close down rather than accede to their wage demands.

In industry an employer can be forbidden by law from closing his business to avoid negotiating legitimate union demands, and it is my conviction that it is an ill woodwind player who does not deserve the same protection.

But, apart from the merits of the dispute, whether the Met runs next season or not is of limited importance.

Certainly it should not compete, even momentarily, for the attention of the one man upon whom the destiny of Western civilization may depend. Yet that is exactly what happened.

NOT HIS BUSINESS

Mr. Kennedy intervened in the dispute, to an extent unknown here but doubtless in a superficial manner. But however brief his participation in this tempest in a cultural teapot, he did spend a measurable fraction of his time and energy delving into a concern that was none of his business.

There are other examples of the President's preoccupation with being Johnny-on-the-spot. The disgraceful episode of airplane hijacking provided an unexampled opportunity for the White House imagemakers to get their principal into the limelight.

Has anyone thought to ask why it was necessary to shoot up the hijacked jet in El Paso, when a truck parked across its bow would have effectively—and safely—prevented a takeoff attempt?

The business about the President being in charge was mostly public relations happy talk, of course, but suppose the airplane had exploded when the lawmen were cheerfully shooting out its tires and one engine?

Any President is always a politician, and none can dispute his right to take reasonable measures to insure his reelection.

But there is a line where ordinary political corn shucking becomes compulsive attention to minutiae and, guided by his clamorous imagemakers, the President has crossed it.

She's the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, a woman who has devoted much time in her life to easing the sufferings of others, although she herself has been handicapped since infancy, will be honored on Saturday with the designation as "Catholic Woman of Year."

She will be so designated by the National Catholic War Veterans at their annual convention in Atlantic City, N.J.

The recipient of this honor is Mrs. Mary Cassidy Varick, of 241 Pacific Avenue, Jersey City, a constituent of mine. The inspiring story of Mrs. Varick has been published in the August 14 issue of the Jersey Journal and I would like to include this excellent article as part of my remarks along with my congratulations and best wishes:

SHE'S THE NEWS: HER CRUSH ON LIFE CONQUERS CRUSHING BLOWS

Mrs. Mary Varick found out early in life that suffering and sickness may be a condi-

tion of being human but that acceptance and unselfishness partook of the divine.

At 18 months she was stricken with polio and faced the life of a cripple. Her mother, however, would not let bitterness become part of the growing girl's outlook. "God loves you more than the others," was her mother's words. "He made you special. God saved the world by suffering so suffering can be the most important thing in the world."

The young child took the words to heart and built a philosophy of life upon it. Next week, Mrs. Varick, the mother of four, will be honored as Catholic Woman of the Year in Atlantic City at the convention of the Catholic War Veterans.

Mrs. Varick was chosen for the honor for her activities as a mother, founder of the First Saturday Club, and the initiator of a series of pilgrimages to the shrine of St. Anne deBeaupre in Quebec.

Mrs. Varick began the First Saturday Club for the spiritual and recreational benefit of crippled people. On the first Saturday of each month, the club attends mass in a group and devotes the rest of the day to recreation.

She first journeyed to the Canadian shrine in 1951 when she was suffering from cancer of the bone. Doctors were pessimistic about her chances of survival. But Mrs. Varick was convinced that her prayers would be answered. The disease was cured.

Mrs. Varick and her husband then determined to aid other cripples to visit the shrine. They organized bus trips for the cripples. Her husband, William, a busdriver for Public Service Co., drove the bus and also donated his salary to make up the deficits.

This year the two organized two tourist bus pilgrimages to the shrine to raise funds for a charter plane pilgrimage for cripples. Last Sunday they returned from the shrine. Fifty-four cripples had made the trip on the special plane and a total of 71 cripples assembled at the shrine.

Another tourist bus ride to the shrine leaves on August 19. The proceeds from this trip will go to make up the deficit that the plane pilgrimage encountered. Space on his bus is still available.

"I'm the crazy dreamer but my husband is the real worker," Mrs. Varick says. "The work we do is a work of love. The one thing that you can't give away is happiness. The more you share your own joy, the more comes to you."

Mr. Varick believes that pain is wealth and that wealth should not be squandered. "Pain changes a person's life. Only if you accept it can the cross be borne cheerfully. Some of the cripples I know are the most joyous people. They know that they haven't been abandoned by God but chosen by Him for special happiness."

It is this type of faith that enables Mrs. Varick to face the future knowing that a disease of the cornea will cause her to become totally blind.

She faces this future with the calm acceptance that has accompanied her in all her difficulties. Right now she looks forward to next week and the convention in Atlantic City with veterans who have also witnessed suffering. "It will be the chance for one veteran like myself to talk with the other veterans. Many of us have things in common."

Answers to Tannenwald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, at the close of my remarks on the floor

today regarding the gratuitous insult to Members of the House offered this morning on NBC's "Today" television show by Theodore Tannenwald, Jr., special assistant to the Secretary of State, my colleague from Michigan [Mr. FORD] directed attention to still another officious lobbying effort on the part of this special assistant.

In this earlier venture, Mr. Tannenwald took on the eminent columnist, Mr. Arthur Krock, in a letter published in the New York Times. His effort has prompted the apt and tart comment by Mr. Krock that this "subordinate official on the heavily populated assistant level considers it within his function and responsibility to act as high policy spokesman and debater in the public press."

Under permission to extend my remarks, I enclose a letter from Congressman FORD published in today's New York Times in response to Mr. Tannenwald's brash contradiction of testimony by two Cabinet officers. I also enclose Mr. Krock's comments today on the same matter:

FUNDS FOR FOREIGN AID—ISSUE TAKEN WITH TANNENWALD ON BORROWING AUTHORITY PROVISO

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It is appalling that a high official of the administration such as Theodore Tannenwald, special assistant to the Secretary of State, would make some of the statements he does in his August 9 letter to you denouncing Arthur Krock's August 4 column as "omitting a number of pertinent facts and not stating accurately other facts," about the 5-year back-door borrowing provision in the administration's foreign-aid bill.

Mr. Tannenwald is in some respects guilty of what he deplores. He even put himself in direct opposition to testimony of his superiors. And he hangs on legalisms and indulges in technicalities.

Mr. Tannenwald correctly notes that, as now written, the legislation requires the President annually to submit a budget to Congress under the Corporation Control Act showing how the funds are to be used, etc. Then he says:

"The President will not be able to obligate or spend these funds until Congress has enacted an authorization in an appropriation bill for the use of the funds."

SECRETARY DILLON'S TESTIMONY

Many Members of Congress regard this as opposite to what Treasury Secretary Dillon told the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in the following exchange:

"Senator WILLIAMS. As I understand it, and I think we ought to get this clear, you come back each year and report to Congress, but you do not need any additional action on the part of the Congress to get the money if we approve this bill as it is written; is that correct?" "Secretary Dillon: That is correct."

I fail to see how both Secretary Dillon and Mr. Tannenwald can be right.

Mr. Tannenwald indulges the obvious when he asserts that Congress would have full legal power to limit the use of these funds. Of course it would. It is a rare occasion when the Congress is without raw legal power—note the word "legal"—to change its mind and amend a law in practically any way it deems appropriate. But hanging on legalisms here substantially begs the question—certainly where delicate and far-reaching arrangements with sovereign foreign nations are involved.

His superior, Secretary Rusk, told the House Committee on Appropriations that: "As a matter of the law and the Constitution, it [Congress] would have the same

control. However, I would be less than candid if I did not say that the exercise of that control by the Congress on an annual basis would be a more serious step in terms of our commitments and relations with other governments than would be true under the present arrangement."

LIMITING EXPENDITURES

This question of control by Congress is so crucial to the understanding and consideration of the proposition that I again quote from Secretary Dillon. He was asked what would be the situation if Congress decided to cut a part of the \$8.8 billion but in the meantime under long-range programming, commitments had been made with foreign countries. Could Congress then limit expenditures below what had been committed? Dillon said:

"I would like to be perfectly clear on that, Senator. Congress does have the authority to limit it, and could limit it, but it would have the effect of the United States not living up to its commitments. So I believe there would be very strong pressure on Congress not to have the United States default on a commitment which it had legally made."

In the face of that statement, Mr. Tannenwald says Mr. Krock was incorrect when he suggested that if Congress were to limit or terminate the previously granted borrowing authority the United States would be in default in its foreign aid commitments. Then hanging on technicalities, he concludes that "there could be no question of a default." Secretaries Rusk and Dillon say otherwise.

Mr. Tannenwald insists it is not true, as Mr. Krock states, that:

"Since technically the executive could commit in 1 fiscal year the entire \$8.8 billion Congress had given it for 5 years, there conceivably could be no money left for Congress to recapture."

Once again, let's see what Secretary Dillon says: "Mr. Passman: In effect, the executive branch could if it should so determine, commit the entire \$8.8 billion during fiscal year 1962 on a conditional basis?" "Secretary Dillon: They could commit \$1.187 million firmly, and they could commit the rest of it conditionally." "Mr. Passman: It could be committed, nevertheless?" "Secretary Dillon: Conditionally, it could be."

In conclusion, this long-term financing proposal, and some others similar to it and now rather commonly known as backdoor financing, raises questions vital to the orderly processes of representative Government. The Congress, as the elected representatives of the people, has but one certain way effectively to control the Government. That is the power of the purse.

So when such a proposition as the pending \$8.8 billion, 5-year borrowing authority is submitted above all things we must know its full dimensions and characteristics before we finally vote. Do what we will—but know what we are doing.

GERALD R. FORD, JR.
Representative, Fifth District, Michigan.

WASHINGTON, August 10, 1961.

IN THE NATION—MIXED SIGNALS AND DUTIES ON THE NEW FRONTIER (By Arthur Krock)

Whatever may be the final form of the administration's foreign-aid bill, the determined efforts in the Senate and House to retain more committed control over, and reduce, the expenditure of the \$8.8 billion the President wants to finance long-term development loans reveal the depth of the disbelief in Congress that the effects of the proposal merely would be to institute sound business practices in the program. The questioning of high officials by congressional committee members inevitably discloses the potential apparatus of a 5-year legislative

loss of control of the loaning activity that could be regained only at the default of commitments already made in the name and on the honor of the United States.

Perhaps Congress ultimately will agree, as in other instances it has, to this fundamental self-limitation on its constitutional power of the purse over annual Government spending and commitments of future spending. But, if so, in this case that will not be because of the lawyers' quibbles and bureaucratic technicalities by which administrative agents and floor spokesmen in Congress have sought to obscure this inevitable consequence. Substantial approval will have been given despite these attempts to gloss over the realities.

The causes will be three in particular: (1) The President's total involvement of his political fortunes and his personal prestige with the fate of his loans plan; (2) its intrinsic merit as sound administrative procedure; (3) the new and recurring international crises which require that his national leadership shall not be cast in the serious doubt he deliberately risked by almost equating congressional action on his development loan program with a vote of personal and official confidence in his conduct of U.S. foreign policy.

THE BOWERY ARGUMENT

The strategy of this final pressure on Congress has been organized to the point where every event abroad, every vote in Congress on the foreign aid program, is cited by members of his Cabinet as a reason why Congress should authorize a 5-year Treasury fund for development loan projects on which the President can draw without further legislative action. This tactic, and the personal and patronage politics the President has played to get the votes of Members who doubt or oppose his plan, are wholly legitimate, and no invention of the Kennedy administration. Alfred E. Smith approvingly described these pressures as the Bowery argument which the American political system often makes it necessary for men in office to employ for high purposes.

Evasion or concealment of the actual meaning and effects of actions urged on Congress by the President also represent no innovation of the Kennedy administration. Therefore the letter typical of such an endeavor, which was published on this page last week from Theodore C. Tannenwald, Jr., a special assistant to Secretary of State Rusk, was traditional. In attacking as ignorant and uninformed an analysis of the President's long-term loan proposal that appeared in this space on August 4, Tannenwald was merely resorting to the bureaucratic device of asserting that plainly labeled interpretation and estimate had been represented as accomplished mathematical facts.

A response to this letter from Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., of Michigan, published on this page today, sufficiently exposes the basic flaws in its construction. And FORD, an undeviating Republican supporter of foreign aid, demonstrates by documentation that the analysis of the loan proposal's effects made by Secretary Rusk's special assistant conflicts head on with testimony by his chief and Secretary Dillon before congressional committees.

But the Tannenwald letter was an innovation in another important respect. It reveals that the profusion and duplication of top authority grants by President Kennedy make this the first administration in which a subordinate official on the heavily populated special assistant level considers it within his function and responsibility to act also as high policy spokesman and debater in the public press. This is an expansion for him of an assignment to lobby for the foreign aid bill at the Capitol.

That is a risky combination of duties, assigned or assumed, particularly when its

byproduct is a public denial of legislative effects which have been conceded by Government superiors. Possibly that is why it has not previously been undertaken.

Newburgh Policy on Welfare Payments Helps Solve Many Community Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

MR. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, those who are interested in cutting the rising crime rate in many of our communities, and to generally improve community life, should find some interesting facts in the following article from the Wall Street Journal on the effect of the new welfare code adopted by Newburgh, N.Y.

THE NEW NEWBURGH: WELFARE PSYCHOLOGY, CIVIC REFORMS CHANGE CITY'S LOOK

(By Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

NEWBURGH, N.Y.—While much attention has been fixed in recent weeks on this city's progress in enacting a more rigid welfare code, the controversial code itself and the publicity it has fomented have resulted in a variety of interesting secondary results. For although the new regulations have not yet of themselves directly affected the city's welfare load, they have indirectly helped to alleviate several historic community problems.

Since the 13-point program went into effect on July 15, for instance, the crime rate in Newburgh's Water Street slum area has fallen markedly. For the first time in many months, nobody from the Water Street district was a defendant at a session of municipal court. This in itself is extraordinary because in the past few years that district has been far and away the biggest headache for the police department.

A visitor quickly senses the changed atmosphere on an after-dark tour of the Water Street area. The streets are quiet and almost empty, except for small groups of children here and there playing hopscotch or hide-and-seek under a street light. The bars are doing business as usual but they are doing it quietly. Just 6 weeks ago it was common for a sidewalk stroller to have to step off the curb to get around a couple of men (or women) preparing to settle a dispute in direct fashion. Also, during the wee hours, one was likely to see a crowd of 50 or 60 men and women gathered in front of a tavern, chattering excitedly and drunkenly shoving each other about.

City officials view the changed atmosphere with satisfaction, and they contend that the new welfare psychology is responsible for the change.

BROAD APPROACH

"What most people outside of Newburgh fail to realize," says City Manager Joseph McD. Mitchell, "is that our new welfare code is just one part of a broad approach to community problems. We are now working hard to improve zoning laws, eliminate the many fire hazards in some parts of town, remedy unsanitary conditions in poorer neighborhoods, press forward with our urban renewal projects, provide additional offstreet parking in the downtown area, and we're trying by various means to boost the local economy."

The most noticeable result of the tougher city attitude is that residents seem to be gaining a new respect for city hall. This is partly due to reawakened civic pride but probably more to the stringent measures the city is using in its broad attack on local problems. And adoption of the welfare code served to convince many doubters that the city meant business.

Newburgh, to illustrate the community's new approach, has had a long-time garbage problem. Residents had over the years put out their garbage with little care for neatness. Refuse cans often had no covers and sometimes great piles of trash were simply set out with no container at all—and the wind and dogs could be counted on to scatter garbage on lawns and in streets. But today Newburgh's garbage problem no longer exists. An offender first gets a warning, but on the second offense he is pulled into court and, if found guilty, is liable to a stiff fine.

One of the dilemmas that prompted the new welfare code, aside from rising public relief costs that threatened to force a real estate tax boost of 30 percent, was the deterioration of the Water Street area. Newburgh now has an inspection team composed of fire, sanitation, housing, building, and plumbing inspectors who jointly give a dwelling a thorough once over.

CONVERSION OF DWELLINGS

The Water Street area is populated almost exclusively by Negroes, and many of these are migrant workers from the South who drifted into town when the picking season on surrounding farms was over. They were able to find space to live because for years the city looked the other way when half a dozen families crowded into one-family houses. Now Newburgh has a law which prohibits the conversion of a one-family dwelling into more than three separate units. And, while no statistics are available, city officials believe the influx of migrants has been slowed and that many of these newcomers are leaving town.

City Manager Mitchell contends it is still too early to judge the effect of the new welfare code on the city's welfare costs. Newburgh is moving slowly, he says, out of common prudence and because Peter Z. Petrillo, the new welfare commissioner, needs time to become acquainted with individual cases. Mr. Petrillo, a former school teacher with no welfare experience, recently replaced John J. O'Donnell, who resigned because he disagreed with the new code.

But if enforcement of the code is going slowly, the atmosphere the code has engendered is already causing a drop in public assistance costs. Since January, for instance, when new welfare rules were being actively considered, until July, when those rules were adopted, the number of home relief and aid to dependent children cases dropped from 266 to 135. At an annual rate, this amounts to a cost reduction of \$163,860. The city had been spending about \$1 million yearly on welfare, about half of which was paid by local taxpayers with the other half coming from the State and Federal Government.

The 13-point program, aimed at weeding out the undeserving from the welfare rolls, includes such items as ending aid to unwed mothers who continue to have children, putting able-bodied reliefers to work for the city, and cutting off assistance to recipients who have been on the rolls for more than 3 months—except in cases involving the elderly and the disabled.

And there are about a dozen more regulations to come. Mr. Mitchell isn't saying what these additional restrictions will be, but it is known that the city is seriously considering a law which will force relatives of needy persons to assume responsibility for their support. The city council believes, for instance, that many elderly people, now living in the local old people's home, are a public

burden because their families, living nearby, refuse to care for them.

New York State welfare officials, incensed by Newburgh's do-it-yourself revamping of its welfare system, is seeking a court injunction prohibiting the city from carrying out its program. Supreme Court Justice John P. Donohue is expected to rule on the State's request shortly.

Aside from the politically volatile nature of the case, State officials are alarmed because they fear that Newburgh's action might deprive the whole State of Federal welfare aid. The Federal Government requires that a State, to be eligible for welfare funds from Washington, must administer its welfare program in a uniform manner. And Newburgh's new code is far stricter than those of other municipalities in the State.

PATCHWORK JOB

Meantime, Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is considering a major overhaul of Federal welfare laws. Thus far, Mr. Ribicoff has not commented directly on the Newburgh case, but he has termed the entire system of Federal welfare aid patchwork job.

Liberal charges that Newburgh is following a reactionary style of municipal government are denied by city officials who contend the city is aggressively, and progressively, working to improve the general welfare. The city, for instance, will soon announce a \$500,000 outlay to improve parking and traffic conditions in the shopping district. It has urged establishment of a major jet airport at a site 30 miles from the city—this at a time when most municipalities are doing their best to keep the jet airliners away from their doors.

Newburgh is also in the process of clearing a blighted area for a third public housing project, even though a previous project—the Bourne Apartments in the Water Street section—became a civic menace when the occupants created every manner of nuisance.

Mrs. Hattie Howard, walking her dog along the Broadway shopping area, reflected for a moment "on all the excitement around here" and declared: "I don't know what will come of the new welfare code, and I'm not even sure it's fair to everybody. But I'll tell you this. Newburgh is becoming a better place to live because more people are interested in what's going on. And I think we're all pretty proud of our little city."

United States Buys Russian Jeeps for Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of concern exists among many of our colleagues with respect to our foreign aid program and the fact that at times the United States is forced to participate in programs which benefit the Soviets.

One of our California colleagues has an extensive study underway on this very question. The Honorable GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, who is a member of the House Appropriations Committee, has made some findings that are significant, especially today when we are considering the foreign aid legislation.

Under unanimous consent I include herewith an article that appeared in the Washington Daily News on August 15, 1961, by Mr. Charles Keely of the Copley News Service. It reveals the sad fact that the United States is now buying Russian jeeps for the use of Fidel Castro agents.

It's UNCLE WHO PAHO's BILL

(By Charles Keely)

U.S. taxpayers are buying Russian jeeps for Fidel Castro.

Thirty-two of the vehicles have been furnished Cuba, allegedly for purposes of malaria eradication.

These charges were made by a ranking members of the House Appropriations Committee who says he will present the matter to the full committee when it considers the foreign aid appropriations bill later this month.

Representative GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, Republican, of California, says the jeeps were given Cuba by the World Health Organization (WHO) working in conjunction with the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO).

DUAL ROLE

PAHO serves a dual role; it is the regional agency of WHO and also a branch of the Organization of American States (OAS).

The United States pays most of the bills; it picks up 33 percent of the annual WHO tab and 66 percent of PAHO's.

The Russian jeeps are part of the Soviet Union's contribution in kind to the WHO fund. The United States contributes dollars. In 1951 U.S. participation amounted to 66 percent of the combined PAHO/WHO fund of \$7,665,181.

Representative Lipscomb claims, however, that the U.S. contribution is even greater because of the large amount of unpaid quotas by other countries.

Cuba, for instance, hasn't paid since Castro took power. Castro owes \$224,010.

"It makes no difference whether Russia contributes in kind or cash," Lipscomb says. "The U.S. taxpayer has a major investment in whatever goes out of the fund. In this case it's 32 Soviet jeeps worth \$1,820.75 each."

HIS CLAIM

Representative Lipscomb claims the most jeeps any other nation has been furnished under the malaria eradication program is six. Why six jeeps from the rest of the world to cure Cuban malaria, but 28 from Moscow?

He says the situation is even more incredible in light of statistics which show malaria presents no real danger in Cuba.

"There were only 2.2 cases per 100,000 people in 1959," the lawmaker claims.

Nevertheless, he says, the malaria program's budget had been increased from \$3,521 (when Dictator Fulgencio Batista was in power) in 1958 to \$31,471 in 1959 under Fidel Castro.

"Something's unhealthy about the whole PAHO operation," the Congressman claims. "But I haven't been able to get a diagnosis from either the State Department or OAS."

The jeep situation was only one of several charges Lipscomb made against PAHO.

For instance, he says he can not understand why the program's budget for Cuba has increased from \$37,045 in 1958 to \$213,708 this year with next year's budget calling for \$219,513. Particularly when Cuba isn't paying its share.

Representative Lipscomb says a State Department explanation that it was due to the larger number of Cubans who were traveling today to Russia and Red China where they might pick up diseases was "incredible and fantastic."

KEPT BY CUBANS

The Congressman charges also that the jeeps were not designed for malaria eradication at all but "the Cubans kept them anyway."

He said he has information leading him to believe Cuban nationals, working under the guise of the PAHO are actually Castro agents who use the health pretext to enter homes to look for clandestine meetings and counter-revolutionaries, presumably riding around in jeeps supposed to be used to fight malaria.

He also charges that instead of curing disease, the PAHO fellowship programs are affording Cubans a chance to spread Castro propaganda throughout the hemisphere.

The Congressman says he is hopeful he can persuade the full Appropriations Committee to write language into the foreign-aid bill that will allow Congress to express its objections to contributing U.S. funds to international organizations which give direct help to Communist-controlled nations in this hemisphere.

He says that before such funds could actually be denied the House Foreign Affairs Committee would have to write legislation forbidding grants to such organizations.

Pennsylvania AFL-CIO Opposes Proposed Railroad Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, at its second constitutional convention, held at the Sheraton Hotel in Philadelphia, the Pennsylvania AFL-CIO adopted a resolution on "Railroad Mergers and the Public Interest" commending the Railway Labor Executives' Association and the Standard Railroad Labor Organizations for their courageous campaign against the current effort of railroad managements to gain quick profits from mergers, and calling upon all members to counteract the distortions in the charges of featherbedding which have been leveled against railroad employees.

At the convention a delegate spoke emphasizing the importance of this resolution as it affects the railroad people in the United States. He reminded the delegates that the railroad industry has lost 400,000 workers in the last 5 years.

In the belief that the views of the Pennsylvania AFL-CIO on this subject will be of interest to my colleagues in the House, I, under unanimous consent, include the full text of this resolution in the Appendix of the RECORD:

RESOLUTION 66—RAILROAD MERGERS AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Railroad mergers and consolidations, now becoming more widespread, offer a serious threat to more than the 700,000 workers still on the job and the 400,000 other Americans who have been eliminated from their positions in the last 5 years. Rail employment has declined persistently since World War II ended, the total work force falling from 1,859,000 in 1946 to 708,778 at the end of 1960.

Technological changes and automation have not provided the entire reason for this alarming reduction in the force of railworkers. Able and well-informed spokesmen for the 23 standard railroad labor organizations have presented well-documented cases in recent months before Congressman ELMER HOLLAND's special committee and directly to President John F. Kennedy at Washington to make this fact evident.

It is significant that railroad workers through their organizations have not blindly opposed technological changes over the years. Rail managements, however, blinded by desire for immediate profits, have resisted attempts at adequate planning and consideration for the human elements in instituting these changes.

Result is that, while 600,000 workers have been eliminated in 14 years, American railroads are transporting as much tonnage as was hauled in the 1920's, 1930's and in 1946, with about half the number of men. Loss of business has not brought about the decline in jobs. Management policies have been responsible for a great deal of it.

While going on a merger binge, rail management spends over a million in propaganda under the phony slogan of featherbedding, seeking to add another 200,000 or more operating and nonoperating employees to the list of jobless; reduces its services under retrenchment programs; farms out its work to the detriment of safe and efficient operations and abandons service to the public in cold-blooded fashion.

Carriers have already told the Presidential Study Commission in recent weeks they want to eliminate 35,000 firemen who insure safety on engines, and 20,500 road trainmen and yard helpers.

President Kennedy hearkened to the appeal of the Railway Labor Executives' Association to do something to solve the problem of rising unemployment in the railroad industry as related to the rash of merger programs. He has asked Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg to investigate and submit recommendations for action.

As with automation and technological changes, the railroad labor organization informed the President the workers do not oppose any and all consolidations or mergers of corporations in the industry. Some, they say, under certain circumstances not now being provided will promote a dynamic and expanding economy and are in the public interest.

Railroad labor opposes the current trend of the mad rush of roads to merge. Weaker and financially unsound roads are not the lines to be absorbed, as Congress recommended in the Transportation Act of 1920. On the contrary it is pointed out to the President, a dominating factor in rail merger proposals has been the profit motive, with little attention being paid by the carriers or the ICC to the protection of the public interest.

Railway labor executives point out that the Commission policy in recent years has shown an absence of restraint on railroads in any form; that five major mergers were approved between 1955 and 1960 and none disapproved. More than a score of other carriers are currently involved in merger steps and practically every large railroad in the country is exploring the possibility. Absence from the Transportation Act of 1940 of restrictions and standards such as were in the 1920 act, encourages the ICC present policy. It is worth noting that in the prosperous 15 years following the act of 1940, there was no major railroad merger or consolidation.

Finally, the American people should remember that the public interest is not being served by the present rash of mergers for two principal reasons—

1. Mergers and consolidations of carriers threaten our current struggle to recover from

depression and threaten our future economic progress, dislocating railroad communities in all parts of the Nation.

2. In the event of a national emergency, threat of which is ever present, rail mergers will permit and encourage the disintegration of an essential facility of transportation which cannot be replaced and will weaken our national defense potential. Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Pennsylvania AFL-CIO at its second convention commands the Railway Labor Executives' Association and the 23 standard railroad labor organizations for the courageous and convincing campaign being waged to acquaint the people with the frightening facts of threats to the Nation's present and future well-being and safety represented by the current effort of railroad managements to gain quick profits by mergers; and be it further

Resolved, That officers and members of all affiliates are strongly urged to lend every assistance to fellow workers in the railroad unions to deny and counteract the distortions being promulgated by the railroads, current costly propaganda campaign built around the big-lie technique of using the unfounded charge of featherbedding.

Urban Renewal in the District of Columbia Can Be Made More Humane and Vastly Improved and Strengthened by Providing Tax Abatement, and by Protecting Good Structures and Those That Can Be Salvaged as Was Done So Ably in the Georgetown Section of the Nation's Capital, and Millions of Dollars in Taxes Can Be Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, once again I am compelled to voice my concern for the needless destruction of buildings and sites of local or national historical or architectural interest and the disruption of balanced neighborhoods in the name of urban renewal. This is not offered as an overall criticism of the urban renewal program in the District of Columbia. Instead, I want to focus attention on the need for less emphasis on demolition and complete clearance and greater effort toward rehabilitation and conservation of neighborhoods which perform positive functions for their inhabitants. There is documentation to support the contention that too little attention has been given to the human side of urban renewal; and that historically significant areas, such as the one destroyed by the southwest urban renewal project in the District of Columbia have been swallowed up by inappropriate development. It is my belief that this documentation should serve as a warning to us and as an inducement to review the policies and regulations which have permitted this perversion of so essential and vast a program as urban renewal.

In an attempt to increase emphasis on rehabilitation and conservation we are first in need of a better definition of a slum. An editorial in the July 22, 1961, Saturday Evening Post alleges:

In cities from coast to coast, areas of historic interest, pleasing architecture and gracious living are being condemned as substandard, blighted, deteriorating or plain slum. • • •

Something of the sort is threatened for the West Greenwich Village area in New York City. Fourteen blocks in the most charming part of the city have been designated as a "blighted area," although the people who live there include normal middle-class families with better-than-average incomes, artists, small-business operators, working people of many races—the kind of people you find in any American community which has had a long and natural development. The delinquency rate is low; real estate valuations and taxes have been steadily rising—a uniquely blighted area.

I can cite an example even closer to home. I have reference to the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project. This is a project which is worthy of note, for it truly exemplifies citizen interest in renewal, upgrading, and preservation of a stable community. Nevertheless, there are some features of which I am critical, and I have tried to assist the Kalorama Citizens Association in its efforts to have these features corrected. A part of the plan for the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project is to demolish one side of Lanier Place NW., for the purpose of erecting a parking lot. Lanier Place is an attractive residential street which contains predominantly substantial houses, some of which are valued as high as \$75,000. Surely this does not constitute a slum area which must be removed to be replaced by a parking lot.

In spite of citizen dissatisfaction and the fact that the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project is the first urban renewal project in the District which emphasizes conservation and rehabilitation of existing properties, officials have refused to change the plan for clearing Lanier Place to establish this parking area. The HHFA has already approved an application for Federal planning advance funds, and has made a capital grant of more than \$460,000. Here again is an example of the inappropriate use of some of the funds made available for urban renewal.

The West Greenwich Village area referred to by the Saturday Evening Post parallels on a smaller scale the kind of restoration we have witnessed in old Georgetown. Many of the West Greenwich Village residents have invested heavily in the repair and modernization of fine old brownstones, contributing to the creation of a stable, attractive neighborhood. Clearly, this is the kind of citizen action and interest which is basic to urban renewal. It should be encouraged. It should not be ignored in deference to the bulldozer approach of complete demolition and rebuilding. The taxpayers should not be required to underwrite this kind of social injustice and economic waste.

One city planner who has conducted on-site studies of the effects of urban renewal operations on site tenants, con-

cludes that while urban renewal and rehousing of slum dwellers are necessary and desirable objectives, the means for achieving them are often ill chosen in relation to these objectives:

Redevelopment should be pursued primarily for the benefit of the community as a whole and of the people who live in the slum area, and not for that of the developer or his eventual tenants.

For example, objectives such as attracting middle- and upper-income citizens back from the suburbs, contributing potential shoppers to a declining central retail area, creating symbols of community revival; or providing more statusful surroundings (and parking lots for powerful community institutions (are extraneous objectives).¹

I am in wholehearted agreement with the attitude stated by this city planner, and I sincerely regret the fact that so few of the members of his profession share this humane and sensible point of view. I can only hope that in the not too distant future more city planners, urban renewal agency executives, and other Government officials will see the wisdom of achieving the true objectives of urban renewal—the rehousing of slum dwellers and the upgrading of neighborhoods, through conservation and rehabilitation.

In an appearance before Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, I submitted a statement in support of a proposed revision of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, the statute under which the urban renewal operations of the District of Columbia are conducted. At that time I proposed the following change in language in the Redevelopment Act of 1945:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this act (1) housing (including structures of historic or general significance) which is not substandard in any project area shall be preserved and shall not be demolished or included in the acquisition and assembling by the Agency of the real property in such area; and (2) the owner of any substandard housing (including structures or sites of historic or general significance) in the project area which can be rehabilitated or restored to good condition shall be encouraged and assisted by the Agency to undertake and carry out such rehabilitation or restoration, and such housing (or structures or sites) shall not be demolished or included in the acquisition and assembling by the Agency of the real property in such area unless such owner, after having had a reasonable time following notification by the Agency to complete such rehabilitation or restoration has failed to do so; and in the case of any such failure the Agency, after acquiring such housing (or structures or sites) shall itself provide for the rehabilitation or restoration thereof whenever it determines that such rehabilitation or restoration is desirable or appropriate, and shall dispose of such housing within a reasonable time on such terms as it may consider to be reasonable and in the public interest.

Briefly, my proposal has as its objective the preservation of all sound structures—residential or other—and the avoidance of depredation of buildings or sites possessing local or national historical or architectural interest which

should be preserved as a part of our country's history. I also proposed that the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, likewise be revised to include this language. A similar proposal was among the recommendations of the 1960 tax policy study undertaken by the Citizens Housing and Planning Council of New York. This group also suggested that code enforcement be used as a tool for reducing the cost of urban renewal, and the council proposed that once a firm decision has been made to acquire a specific area for urban renewal, owners of substandard properties be given the choice between prompt rehabilitation or equally prompt demolition.

The Housing Act of 1961 contains several tools for use in conserving and rehabilitating basically sound housing. It is my hope that these instruments will be used to the greatest possible extent. Properly used, and conscientiously administered, the new home improvement loan program and the liberalized FHA insurance provisions can help stem the spread of blight; rehouse low- and middle-income families in housing which they can afford; and prevent the needless demolition of homes and other buildings, and the disruption of neighborhood ties and associations. However, it does not provide for the retention of all sound structures in urban renewal project areas, as does my proposal.

Studies conducted by ACTION American Council to Improve Our Neighborhoods—and other groups—both private and public—have documented the fact that rehabilitation of sound structures is usually less costly than new construction on the same site. Thus, there is a distinct cost advantage in rehabilitation.

In view of our anticipated population growth and the estimate of experts that from 4 to 6 million dwelling units sink below acceptable standards or are demolished every decade, positive steps are required now to prevent a reduction in our overall housing supply. William L. C. Wheaton, a well-known city planner, has estimated that, through rehabilitation, some 400,000 existing dwelling units may be saved from destruction or dilapidation every year. This constitutes another concrete advantage to be gained by a step up in rehabilitation efforts.

The two advantages mentioned—reduction of the cost of urban renewal and saving housing units—are economic gains which could be achieved through rehabilitation. There is also a social benefit of major significance which could be derived from an emphasis on conservation and rehabilitation of slum areas—I have reference to the preservation of established, balanced neighborhoods.

I would like to call the attention of this body to the philosophy of an editorial which appeared in the July 21, 1961, issue of *Life* magazine; it may provide some food for thought. The editorial was a commentary on a recent brochure published for the Citizens' Housing and Planning Council of New York, written by that eminent housing expert, Miss Elizabeth Wood. Miss Wood recommended that public housing develop-

¹ Herbert J. Gans, "The Human Implications of Current Redevelopment and Relocation Planning" (February 1959, Journal of American Institute of Planners).

ments be designed to help the lower income people to learn to be self-policing via "community morale." Life magazine observes that Miss Wood "urges that public housing projects be adorned with pubs, candy stores, loitering places, and other amenities of community life. Instead of strict rules and keep-off-the-grass signs, she would provide places for the teenagers to drink pop and play records while their parents drink beer and play bocce nearby. A concierge would be at their service in the lobby."

The magazine editorial concludes:

Here surely is a reason to stop and think before we let the bulldozers loose on our remaining slums. Many salvageable slums are already well equipped with saloons, candy stores, loitering places, and a humming community life. * * *

The housing problem requires many different solutions; but the roles of the bulldozer, the big project, and the professional housers have long been overdone. If some rents have to be subsidized, it can surely be done without creating economic ghettos which, whether bleak or pretty, are no more democratic than the other kind. Tax reforms, better incentives, for private landlords, easier credit for rehabilitation—there are many ways we can stop slums from developing, and so nourish the living communities of real people that make our great cities worth saving.

During this session of the Congress I introduced a bill in the House which sought to allow homeowners to deduct from their income tax payments the expenses incurred in modernization and rehabilitation of their homes, and to permit an accelerated rate of amortization of the costs of such repairs and improvements. It is my contention that this incentive to homeowners is a step which the Congress and the Internal Revenue Bureau should not hesitate to take. There are others who share this view.

For example testimony before the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee this year revealed the deep concern of mayors and housing officials over the continuation of tax practices which tend to perpetuate the slums rather than eliminate them. Richard L. Strout, reporting on these hearings in the May 11, 1961 Christian Science Monitor stated that planning authorities charged "that today's municipal taxes harness the profit motive backward."

The slumlord who buys property and lets it deteriorate, they charge, is benefited by taking a depreciation allowance. If he sells for less than he paid he gets a tax rebate.

If the same man tried to improve his slum dwelling by painting or renovating it, he would be taxed higher on the higher value.

Similarly a University of Wisconsin law professor, Arthur D. Sporn, has concluded that "within our legal system the depreciation allowance provisions of Federal and State income tax laws, as they apply to rental housing may be promoting the persistence and spread of slums."

Professor Sporn based his conclusion upon a thorough study of the depreciation provisions of the Federal income tax law and legislation and other activity aimed at slum clearance in the United States. His study revealed that depreciation rules encourage irrespon-

sible and deleterious operation of rental housing; discourage investment in new housing; and contribute to the shortage of building sites for new housing.

I was particularly interested in Mr. Sporn's analysis of the consequences of our failure to revise our tax regulations. Says Mr. Sporn:

In the case of slum housing the public subsidy that contributes to the maintenance of values, and hence to the level of capital investment being recovered through depreciation, comes from at least three separate sources: from the relief and other welfare payments made to tenants by welfare and other public agencies, part of which goes toward payment of rent; from the furnishing of municipal services at excessive costs; and from purchases made in condemnation proceedings.¹

Surely a dynamically progressive country such as ours, built upon honesty, integrity, and individual enterprise, and having as one of its motivating principles "the greatest good for the greatest number," cannot afford the continuation of practices which thwart progress, and benefit the few at the expense of the many.

In taking the actions which I have proposed in my two bills, we would not be setting an uncharted course. Washington's Georgetown, Boston's Beacon Hill, New York's Sutton Place—all are living proof that renewal through rehabilitation can be successful. Australia's and New Zealand's experiences with land value taxation has proved that tax abatement on building improvements can be effective.

If slum clearance and rehousing of slum dwellers are worthy objectives—and I am convinced that they are—they must be encouraged. This we can do by not penalizing those who improve their property by levying taxes on these improvements, and by promoting continuous urban renewal through tax abatement, emphasis on rehabilitation procedures as opposed to complete demolition and clearance of slum areas. Last, but by no means least, we can prevent the destruction of historic sites and the disruption of community life which has had so detrimental an impact on thousands of families.

I ask that you join me in urging this administration to do everything possible to improve the housing for all American families, to preserve the symbols of our country's history, and to promote neighborhood improvement and stability through rehabilitation of existing housing and the provision of adequate community facilities.

I have today introduced a House joint resolution which provides tax abatement for the improvement of residential property, and, at the same time, protects good housing as well as housing which can be salvaged.

This measure will literally save tens of millions of dollars. If it had been in effect it would have made unnecessary the expenditure of the major part of the \$90 million which is the expected

final cost of the Southwest urban renewal project, and it would have made unnecessary the loss of taxes from business and residential property in the Southwest urban renewal project which is another major and hidden cost of the present type of urban renewal programs being carried on in the District of Columbia.

Third, it would have been much more humane, had it been in effect, and would not have contributed to the spreading of slums throughout the District of Columbia as the present program has. Here is the second major hidden cost of the present type of urban renewal program.

The Destructive Nature of Our Present Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OR

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, George Todt's column in the August 10, 1961, issue of the Los Angeles Herald Express points to the fallacies of our present foreign aid program. It is most timely and would, I am sure, be of interest to every Member of Congress. Under unanimous consent, I insert the column in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BOLSTERING THE U.S. \$\$\$

(Unfortunately, the President's foreign aid program is wasting two of our most precious assets: The stability of the dollar and the competitive power of U.S. industry.—Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1961.)

"The most important issue today is the restoration of international confidence in the dollar," according to London's Samuel Montagu & Co., leading bullion dealers.

The noted French economist, Jacques Rueff, puts it this way:

"A grave peril hangs over the economy of the West. Every day its situation more and more resembles the one that turned the 1929 recession into the great depression. The instability in our monetary system is such that a minor international incident or a small economic or financial disturbance could set off worldwide disaster."

The collapse of the American dollar would mean a collapse of the entire free world economy.

TIME HAS COME

Now the important thing for us to bear in mind is that the strength of our dollar has been continuously drained away by constant erosion of our gold reserve—perhaps the word "hemorrhage" would be more appropriate here—and we lost over \$5 billion in the period 1958-60, alone. How long can this go on at Fort Knox?

"The real significance of the drain on our gold supply," said the influential Senate Committee on Rules and Administration recently, "is that it is a symptom of a basic and potentially disastrous weakness in our economy. This weakness is the deteriorating position of the United States as a supplier of industrial products in world markets."

TO REALLY SEE

One of the basic reasons for this unpleasant factor lies in the fact that the economies of Western Europe and Japan have become

¹ Sporn, Arthur D.: "Some Contributions of the Income Tax Law to the Growth and Prevalence of Slums," Columbia Law Review, vol. 59, Nov. 1959: 1028-1036.

important competitors in world markets. Their brandnew factories and competent mass production techniques compare favorably with ours—and have been largely financed in the past with American taxpayer giveaways.

Utilizing much cheaper labor available in foreign countries, our friends and allies—as well as our enemies on the other side of the Iron Curtain—are underselling and undercutting us all around the globe.

World consumers are not interested in the argument that America has been their great friend in the past. They ask the age-old question:

"What have you done for me recently?" Then they buy goods from the supplier who gives them the best price. This is natural. But the point is that we are up against what amounts to a self-defeating argument: We are paying for our own ultimate economic destruction. Our high-cost-of-labor merchandise will increasingly suffer in competition with the foreign low-cost-of-labor output. What about the future?

It seems to this writer that our allies are going to have to face up to the facts of life, however unpleasant for them. We simply cannot go on carrying the lion's share of the load and getting only the donkey's share in return (see Aesop's Fables).

The controversial U.S. foreign aid program is the difference between solvency and the multibillion dollar annual drain on our threatened gold reserves.

OUR RUIN IS NEAR

Let our friends—if they are indeed our friends—carry their fair share of the load between us. What are they doing now? Why not have a long overdue accounting and find out exactly what has been done by all of us?

The sorry truth is that our allies have milked us for all they can get—and now some of them think we owe them a living.

The recent effrontery of the head of a foreign government telling the U.S. Senate that, like it or not, we were stuck with foreign aid from here on out—and that we had better accept it, or else—left a bad taste in the mouths of most of us. Even though it was obviously a badly staged "spontaneous" effort by the administration to stampede Capitol Hill support in behalf of foreign aid.

BY AID FALLACY

The currently ill-advised plea of giving the administration long-term foreign aid moneys without congressional strings attached could open up a Pandora's box of evils.

If congressional scrutiny has not caused our expensive military structure to collapse because of lack of long-range planning—then what is there to wring our hands about similar year-by-year plans for underdeveloped Afro-Asian nations?

Congress should not abdicate its historical control of the purse.

Once this happens, the international results thereafter could become increasingly weird for us.

Ever hear of the planned \$200 billion boondoggle over a 10-year period by the code name of SUNFED? Ask Representative GLEN LIPSCOMB of Los Angeles.

J.F.K. Aids Far, Far Over Their Heads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Columbus (Ohio) Citizen-Journal re-

cently carried an extremely interesting article by Henry J. Taylor in which he hits the nail right on the head in regard to the great amount of activity at the White House which results in little positive action. I commend it to the reading of the Members of the House:

NO POLITICS PLEASE—J.F.K.'S AIDS FAR, FAR OVER THEIR HEADS

(By Henry J. Taylor)

On ending his report to the Nation about Berlin, President Kennedy said he had found the burdens of the Presidency even greater than he thought when he ran for office. He asked for suggestions and for the public to help him.

The humbleness in this plea is enormously appealing and the sincerity unquestionable. "To know," the Bible calls it; a profoundly meaningful word.

Progressively fighting for the right, as the President is, is the noblest effort the world affords, and I do not like to put things too strongly but I believe that the greatest help the President, and therefore our Nation, can receive is within his own grasp and at his command.

Surely it must begin with the abandonment of inexperienced and immature young associates who are his closest official advisers in the White House. They are intellectuals, fresh from college faculties, but not one has had any experience in government or equally large affairs or been tested in anything like the burdens to which the President himself refers.

The President simply brought with him into places of highest authority the same group who had the highest authority in his election campaign. They are far, far over their heads. The correction is entirely in the President's own hands, as it is elsewhere among advisers where incompetence is evident in the record.

Next, great help will flow to him when, in so properly calling for sacrifices, he himself takes this flag out front. The basic sacrifice any official can make—and it is soon recognized by the public—is not to play politics—with the people's money, with policies, with decisions, with appointments or anything else, and to forget the next election. Yet it is clear that politics as usual, political spending as usual, and all the casting about for reelection is in practice from the White House on down.

No President can control congressional behavior in this respect, but he can control his own. The survival of the United States is not a partisan matter, and partisan affairs are too much for a President or our Nation to bear at a time like this.

Next, failing to be strong, we invite aggression; failing to be solvent, we defeat ourselves. The weapons we are building are the world's best peace insurance. But they are costly beyond comprehension, and every dollar in personal income taxes Washington levies, and more, is already consumed by defense bills alone.

Great help would come to the President's hallowed task by postponing or abandoning other programs which, while desirable or popular, are not essential. Yet, instead, added programs are being sponsored without apparent heed to the cost of it all or how we are to pay for the total load, except through a deficit without tears.

The weapon Russia wants most is an inflated and unstable America. And little separates the Russian sword from our throat. We are faced by a problem of priorities in spending. We need an immediate decision on where to proceed and where to hold back. Not a better life, but humanity in its vastest meaning, is at stake.

Lastly, the Greeks and Romans went into battle under the influence of oratory. But as new weapons became more deadly the

tongue lost much of its force. For false promises, unattainable promises, broken promises—these three things are the curse of men and nations. Knowing this, Prime Minister Winston Churchill was careful with his words, for, as he said:

"The people can face peril or misfortune with fortitude and buoyancy, but they bitterly resent being deceived or finding that those responsible for their affairs are themselves dwelling in a house of artifact. There is no worse mistake in public leadership."

It will be profoundly helpful to the President if he attempts to redeem to the American people the promises made and then contradicted or not kept, and at the same time he speaks no word that exceeds our Government's willingness and capacity to act, as in the tragedy of the unsupported warnings to Russia regarding Cuba and Laos. Nothing is so costly to our authority in the world, and therefore to peace, as eloquence without performance.

Thus a mass of uneasy thoughts burst in today. But the American people would recognize a change in course very fast and respond with a roar of approval, support and allegiance. Otherwise, any President must face a division between those who believe with their ears and those who believe with their eyes. And to force that unwanted division on us would be unworthy of this hour.

In many lands, across many a sea, so far from home, American youth in their sad dust must search our souls. They hail this land, forever, for eternity. So do we.

Our Spending Policies Are a Greater Threat Than Communist Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest articles it has been my privilege to read is the following column written by Henry J. Taylor on where the United States is headed if we continue to adopt socialistic programs in an effort to defeat socialism:

THE EEL UNDER THE ROCK

(By Henry J. Taylor)

When Khrushchev said he would bury us, this man was crazy as a fox. We have the shovel. We are burying ourselves. If Khrushchev has any brains he will just do a Rip Van Winkle and let us do the rest.

We are not fighting communism. We are promoting it; by political spending which punches hard at self-reliance, programs which aggressively make State dependents out of larger and larger parts of our population, tax laws which to a major degree nationalize property and wages, and by the veiled dive into welfare-state socialism which is, in fact, the overall objective.

It is a matter of intent. And this is the intent. It is also the chassis of totalitarianism by any name, and any government in office by less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the majority has no mandate for it whatever.

When you think of socialism, think of the force-content of the plan. That's the key. And socialism's only proven advantage is to the planners themselves. It is notorious as a politician's paradise. It guarantees the planners power by its bribes for votes; supports "the love of governing," as Voltaire defined political ambition; and suits

its intellectual jockeys' cynical dream that they are the brains and we are the horses.

If we do not intend to create free and independent citizens the United States has gone to a great deal of trouble and expense for nothing. This is what the Constitution intended and we depend on everybody to recognize the worth.

Our Constitution was not written to limit the people. The people can always change the Constitution. It was written to limit the politicians. This is why they so often have trouble with it. And today we are witnessing every dodge and ball trick to circle this defense and in a mood, an intent, of conquest. Thus, regardless of cause, the great oath of office becomes nothing more estimable than a ceremony.

The future comes 1 day at a time. There is absolutely no guarantee we can indefinitely withstand totalitarian encroachments. Totalitarianism means adherence to a single will, not necessarily a soldier or personal tyrant. Just one man.

Democracies shatter themselves by blindness to this. The truth is the only hope: We are being deliberately manipulated further and further into such control. This is the eel under the rock and we had better see it. For the facts are undisputable and the truth can stop it if the public grasps the facts.

Back-door spending of billions in foreign aid without congressional control, sweeping Executive decrees having the effect of law without due process of law, multitudinous powerful Government agencies which report only to the President, attacks on the trinity of checks and balances provided by the separation of Federal powers, the battle against the rights of the States—these are all symptoms of a deep malaise imposed on us.

In the quiet accounting our President renders to himself he can take stock at this perilous time, reverse his field, forget politics and 1964, and abandon the thrust toward welfare state socialism—abandon partisan powerplays and Government by indirect coercion and see as the fine patriot which he is that these are intolerable now in the country he loves as much as any man alive.

Defensive Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this body to an editorial that appeared in the August 7 edition of Aviation Week magazine. This contains an admonishment to each of us here in the Congress, to the President and most directly to the Secretary of Defense. This critically analyzes the current and future status of the Air Defense posture of the United States in the light of the three new supersonic strategic bombers exhibited in sufficient quantities to guarantee volume production by the Soviets on July 9, and each armed and equipped with air-to-surface missiles of such ranges as to render our perimeter defenses, totally ineffective.

Under unanimous consent I include this editorial to be entered into the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, offensive and defensive weapons are inescapably tied together, they are interrelated and they are inseparable. Because of leadtimes, and other technical considerations it is constantly essential that we maintain a family of offensive weapons in the various stages of their life cycle. By the same token it is equally essential that we have a similar family of defense weapons in the same stages. Our inventory aircraft, in this dynamic field of technological advancement, must at all times be of sufficient superiority over those of our potential foe to insure success. In other words, our offensive weapons must exceed the capabilities of his defensive weapons and, at the same time, our defensive weapons must exceed the capabilities of his offensive weapons. Our failure to do this is an open invitation to aggression and in the days of thermonuclear bombs to total annihilation.

Where do we stand in the light of these truisms? What hypothetical study, what abstract analysis, what intuitive hunch has led us to our present status—a state of affairs that violates every principle of warfare that have been proven in every battle since Alexander the Great? Beginning at the end of June 1961 our air defense began a decline in both quality and quantity that is as inevitable as the passage of time and as inescapable as taxes. On that day the last all-weather interceptor was delivered to the U.S. Air Force. From that day on, Mr. Speaker the erosion has begun. Mr. Holtz calls it a combination of faulty intelligence and wishful thinking, I call it criminal negligence.

The conferees of both Houses provided \$100 million in the fiscal year 1961 defense appropriations bill for the continued procurement of F-106 all-weather interceptors. This money was not used. There are no moneys requested in the fiscal year 1962 Defense Department budget request for this purpose. We now find ourselves confronted with a possible air offensive from the south—a direction that has been totally neglected. The implications of the supersonic buildup in the Soviet supersonic strategic air force are explicit. The standoff capabilities represented by their air-to-surface missiles is explicit. The implications of the appropriations request to provide \$207 million for American citizens to dig holes in the ground are explicit. The implications of the tone and content of Mr. Khrushchev's fireside chat are explicit.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

The Secretary of Defense gives every evidence that he will recommend against the use of the funds unanimously appropriated by the Congress for the continued production of manned strategic bombers. Our only supersonic long-range manned bomber, the B-58, will be allowed to wither and blow away. The development of the B-70 will be slowed down. Our deterrent capability offensively begins its decline when this decision is made. This makes it all the more mandatory that we take every conceivable means to enhance the caliber and quantity of our air defense system. Unfortunately we canceled

the development of the F-108 long-range interceptor. We cannot reinitiate this program without chaos. We can, however, if we act with dispatch, restart the production of our most advanced all-weather interceptor, the F-106. We can order improved versions with increased speed and range and improved fire-control systems and improved missiles which are capable of meeting the threat. These can begin to be delivered years before a newly designed fighter could be available. The interceptors procured in the interim to insure production continuity can be used to replace much needed attrition losses, to provide for all-weather defensive capability along our southern border and to provide for greater defense in depth. We can enhance the all-weather defensive capabilities of our NATO allies and our allies in SEATO nations to contain the ever increasing threat of the Soviet SAC, the Communist China SAC, and the budding Indonesian SAC.

I have pointed out these things before, Mr. Speaker. I have predicted the state of affairs which now confronts us. We must insist, in deference to our responsibilities to provide for the common defense, in deference to our wives and children, in deference to our responsibilities to the people of the United States and the free world, that the executive department act with dispatch to insure our existence in the future.

DEFENSIVE PROBLEMS

(By Robert Holtz)

The problem of using offensive military weapons offers a wide choice of possibilities that can be tailored in many fashions to suit the varying national policies and purposes of the countries concerned.

For example, the fact that the Soviets are building a second generation of supersonic long-range bombers does not necessarily mean that the best U.S. policy lies in pursuing a similar course. It may be prudent to continue to bolster B-52 and B-58 strength for the immediate future to insure that there is no possibility of a deterrent gap before large numbers of solid-fueled missiles can take over the major portion of that role. But it is becoming increasingly obvious that the development of the mach 3 B-70 bomber offers only marginal possibilities for major military advantage for the time period into which it has now slipped.

Although the Air Force is clinging to the B-70 project with emotional fervor, many people are raising the question whether the substantial funding now being poured into the B-70 program could not be invested with more profit to the defense posture in some other, considerably more advanced methods of waging long-range offensive warfare. This is a debate that is likely to grow in intensity as the inexorable technical logic of this situation backs the blue-suited emotions into a tight corner.

When it comes to the problems of defense, however, there is no choice available except to counter the enemy's weapons. The kind of defense that this country builds is of necessity determined by the kind of weapons the Soviets develop to wage offensive warfare. Among the prime requisites in building adequate defensive forces yesterday to beat the enemy's offensive capability of today are accurate intelligence and intelligent foresight. It is always too late to research, develop, produce and deploy a defensive system if you wait until the enemy reveals his new offensive equipment, even in prototype form.

Thus, it is obvious that we should have been working on a defensive system against Soviet ICBM's even before we got the first intelligence confirmation that they had indeed embarked on the development of this type of weapon. Unfortunately, our ICBM defense effort has been confined to the single channel of the Nike-Zeus approach, plus a rather thinly funded broad research study sponsored by ARPA. It is impossible to determine at this point in technology whether a successful defense can be developed against the ICBM. But history records that no "invulnerable" weapon has ever been developed and that an effective counter always appears, with its appearance timed in direct ratio to the amount of effort devoted to its development.

The current scale of our ICBM defense effort suggests that it should be increased in intensity and expanded in scope. For an effective ICBM defense offers the strong possibility of achieving strategic checkmate in a single move. The country that first develops and demonstrates an effective defense against ICBM's can rule the international roost for that period in the foreseeable future until new types of offensive weapons emerge to make the ICBM obsolete.

Although we get only faint sniffs of the Soviet effort at developing an anti-ICBM system, it would be foolish to assume that they are not pushing this program to the limit of their available technical resources. As a nation of chess players, the significance of this move could hardly be lost on the Soviet leaders.

In the same vein, we should be devoting considerable effort today to developing defensive capability against weapons that may eventually be deployed through space, even though it is not yet clear exactly in what form the space offense will emerge as a genuine threat some years hence. Such projects as the Air Force Saint (satellite interceptor) represent a sound forward step toward solving the defensive problems of tomorrow, even though its details sound like science fiction to the taxpayer today.

But one area in which we find ourselves in serious defensive difficulty is the old-fashioned business of air defense against manned bombers. Based on a combination of faulty intelligence and wishful thinking, our national leaders of some years ago convinced themselves that the Soviets had abandoned manned bomber development and that it was safe to let our air defense system deteriorate into eventual obsolescence.

There is still some effort at the top level in the Pentagon to dismiss the Soviet supersonic bomber and tanker developments with the hackneyed Detroit-manufactured sneers of "The Russians aren't 10 feet tall," and "How do we know these new Russian bombers aren't just prototypes built to fool us into going in the wrong direction?" This was the same sort of malarkey pedaled by the Central Intelligence Agency after the 1956 Tushino air show. Despite the protestations of Messrs. Dulles and Khrushchev, the Soviets have continued development of manned flying machines across the entire technical spectrum from supersonic bombers to helicopters and convertiplanes.

It is against the threat of the new Soviet supersonic bombers with their high-speed jet tanker support, combined with the old Bear and Badger bomber fleet equipped with standoff missiles of sufficient range to avoid Nike-Hercules and make the Bomarc B and the F-106 systems of marginal effectiveness, that our defenses are critically weak. We once had adequate military plans to counter this future threat with the long-range F-108 mach 3 interceptor and a modernized SAGE and DEW-line system. But all of these plans were scrapped on the ground that no such future threat would exist.

In our current preoccupation with the development of a variety of technically sound

new offensive weapons, we should not neglect a more intensive and intelligent evaluation of our future defensive requirements than we have devoted to this area in the past.

The Ideological Battle of Constitutional Conservatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the current attack on constitutional conservatism is discussed in a column by George Todt which appeared in the August 2, 1961, issue of the Los Angeles Herald Express. Thinking that Members of Congress will want to read Mr. Todt's column, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"GIVE ME LIBERTY OR"

"In much of your talking, thinking is half murdered."—KAHLIL GIBRAN, the prophet.

(By George Todt)

Seen from the ideological viewpoint of constitutional conservatives, the most dangerous man in America may well be Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas. He is chairman of the influential Foreign Relations Committee, former Rhodes scholar to England's Oxford University and a power in the controversial Bilderburg Group.

The latter is particularly adverse to publicity, but has been pretty well established as a form of "Atlantic Union" type of fellowship dedicated to erosion or loss of U.S. sovereignty.

Consider these recent words of FULBRIGHT as he addressed the 1961 Cuberly Conference on Education at Stanford University.

MANY YEARS AGO

"The President is hobbled in his task of leading the American people to consensus and concerted action by the restrictions of power imposed on him by a constitutional system designed for an 18th century agrarian society, far removed from the centers of world power.

"It is imperative that we break out of the intellectual confines of cherished and traditional beliefs and open our minds to the responsibility that basic changes in our system may be essential to meet the requirements of the 20th century ***"

"I do not know whether the American people can be aroused in time from their current apathy and indifference and educated to the necessity for challenging tasks and policies that break sharply with the traditions of the past.

"I do feel certain that if a consensus for dynamic and imaginative action is to be formed, it is the President who must shape it."

BRAVE MEN SPOKE

FULBRIGHT's apparent scorn for our "constitutional system designed for an 18th century agrarian society, far removed from the centers of world power" is not shared by those who study and understand history.

Our ingenious Founding Fathers rejected all notions of a government with dictatorial and tyrannical powers, accordingly instituted our famed system of checks and balances between our executive, legislative and judiciary sections. None can gain complete ascendancy over the others.

Now this does not make for governmental

streamlining and quick decisions overnight—but we have never had a Hitler, Stalin or even King George III.

Which is better? What is wrong with making the American system of government free from tyranny? Who wants a dictator in the United States?

I think we are well off today, Senator FULBRIGHT to the contrary, and we all ought to take a long second look at any siren call for changes in our constitutional system. Although designed for an 18th century agrarian society at the outset, it was also much more than that alone.

NOW WE KNOW

The American constitutional system has stood the test of time. In 185 years it has taken us from the position of a small agrarian society to that of the most powerful nation in history.

The British parliamentary system, which Senator FULBRIGHT admires so much, is now presiding over the breakup of the largest empire in modern times. What is the incentive here to make a change?

Who wants a dictatorship? All dictator-led nations throughout the world as of right now, including Russia, have less than one-third of our celebrated standard of living. Why should we complain?

Senator FULBRIGHT is a man who will require considerable watching by American conservatives—neither apathetic nor indifferent—in the unpredictable days ahead. Who is he?

The former Rhodes scholar received his education at Oxford, hotbed of British Fabian Socialists. The latter are closely akin to our homegrown variety of socialistic Americans for Democratic Action. If they could have their way, leaders of the ADA would take us into Fabian socialism without delay. FULBRIGHT is one of their pampered darlings.

IT WAS NO JOKE

The Arkansas Senator first made the headlines as a result of now-deceased Senator Joseph McCarthy labeling him "Senator Half-Bright" in his war against fifth column subversion.

I have always considered it a grave tactical error to be insulting toward an ideological opponent. In truth, I think FULBRIGHT gained much from McCarthy's diatribes against him. He took on the mantle of a martyr.

Throughout the years, FULBRIGHT has lent much support to the radical concept of Atlantic union—a concept which, incidentally, would benefit Great Britain much more than the United States. Why should we be the tail on the kite?

Not long ago FULBRIGHT was taken sharply to task in the Senate by Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, a staunch Democrat conservative.

THURMOND, also a major general in the U.S. Army Reserve, spoke out strongly against FULBRIGHT's recent secret memorandum to the Pentagon—which got leaked, incidentally—against officers of the armed services appearing on anti-Communist platforms in public. What gives?

Brooklyn: The Borough of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, few communities of the world can claim as familiar an identification all over the world

as the great Borough of Brooklyn. I have no knowledge yet as to whether this great community has been heard of spatially but when we are I am sure we will be described in words connoting progress, true brotherhood, and social responsibility. I would direct the attention of my colleagues to a recent article complimentary in tone which reflects to the Borough of Brooklyn:

BROOKLYN PROGRESS

Borough President John Cashmore did not live to see the 1960-61 edition of Brooklyn Progress, the title of his annual reports year after year. Mr. Cashmore died on May 7, but, because most the work was done under his direction, the 44-page brochure has been issued in his name and forwarded to Mayor Wagner by Borough President Hayes.

Like the preceding reports, the 1960-61 volume goes far beyond the scope of the borough president's immediate responsibilities and surveys Brooklyn generally. For many years the downtown Brooklyn civic center has been taking shape; now we learn that the center has stimulated public and privately financed improvements in the area worth \$258,860,000. These include housing projects, office structures, and banks, to name a few.

Brooklyn resisted the effects of the 1960-61 economic recession "far better than most large industrial and business communities"; Brooklyn manufacturers turn out, each year, products valued at \$1,750 million in 7,500 local manufacturing plants, and the volume of Brooklyn's retail sales business for 1960 was \$2,313 million or \$80 million higher than in 1959. The report cites these facts in making a case for the borough as being both stable and dynamic.

Big Push in Soviet Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post features an article entitled "Big Push in Soviet Propaganda," written by the authors of "The Ugly American," Eugene Burdick and William J. Lederer. It is pertinent to the provisions and objectives of H.R. 8400 now before the House and due to be voted upon this week.

It is strong support for those who recognize the seriousness of the worldwide struggle now confronting all free nations and who think, as do I, that the Mutual Security Act proposals are ill advised, costly, and wasteful, and would turn over to the Executive powers and responsibilities which under our Constitution belong to and must be retained by Congress. The authors of the article, which I present here for the RECORD, make a valuable contribution to straight thinking:

BIG PUSH IN SOVIET PROPAGANDA: TO PRESENT A BROTHERLY AND BENEFICENT IMAGE, RUSSIA BACKS A GLOBAL ORGANIZATION WITH TREMENDOUS POWER AND BIG MONEY—A REPORT BY THE AUTHORS OF "THE UGLY AMERICAN"

(By Eugene Burdick and William J. Lederer)

In Manila a young Filipino writer opens an envelope, finds a check for 750 pesos—the

largest sum he has ever received for an article. Twenty-eight hundred miles to the southwest, at the airport in Ceylon, an anxious mother and her paralyzed son are carefully placed in a plane and before the plane has made altitude a doctor is examining the boy. Five thousand miles to the northwest, in a sunny Russian schoolroom, 60 8-year-old children expectantly face the door, waiting for a distinguished dark-skinned visitor. When he enters, they sing a song of welcome in Hindi, his native language.

Three rather touching scenes—but they all bear the mark made in Moscow. These three episodes are typical of thousands that occur around the world as a part of a comprehensive Communist propaganda program. Only recently have Western scholars been able to put together the fragments of this massive Soviet propaganda apparatus and make educated estimates of its range.

Americans, used to the bluster of Khrushchev and the blatancy of May Day parades in Red Square, will be surprised at the delicacy with which this devastating, yet invisible structure operates.

In the opinion of many experts this propaganda machine is more dangerous than nuclear-armed ICBM's. The Soviet effort costs \$2 billion a year directly and probably twice that much indirectly. By contrast the United States spends about one twentieth as much in money and one one-hundredth as much in effort and intellectual skill.

The Soviet effort is not merely massive. To a startling degree it can pinpoint small targets. Take the three examples mentioned. The Filipino writer had received his check from the Foreign Language Publishing House in Moscow. Although he is a professed "Philippine nationalist," he is now receiving over half of his income from Soviet royalties. The anxious Ceylonese mother with the paralyzed son was flown to Moscow, where her son was given treatment at a polio institute and returned home much improved. The mother, in addition to being an influential journalist, is related to the secretary of a powerful Ceylonese politician. The class of Hindi-singing children were Russian students at a public school in Moscow and their guest was a prominent Hindi-speaking Indian intellectual. When he returned to India, he praised the Soviet Union's "brotherly interest in India and its culture."

The painstaking details of the Soviet effort are stunning. Grassroots indoctrination begins in the Soviet schools. All Soviet pupils start serious study of a foreign language in the third grade. By the time they have finished high school they have had at least 6 years' training in a foreign language. They do not confine their language training to English, French, Spanish and German, but also have thousands of students studying the so-called "exotic languages" of Africa and Asia. In Singhalese and Bengali, the Russians have a small army of fluent linguists. Our Department of State's Foreign Service does not have a single qualified person—although these languages are spoken by almost 100 million people living in important sensitive areas.

Language is not the whole of propaganda, as we shall see, but it is the vital first step. John Foster Dulles put it this way: "Interpreters are no substitute. It is not possible to understand what is in the minds of other people without understanding their language, and without understanding their language, it is impossible to be sure that they understand what is on our minds."

Soviet language training is so sweeping that Moscow can, if the occasion calls for it, produce tomorrow a skilled plumber who speaks Hindi and is also familiar with the great figures of Hindi literature. As long ago as 1957 Chester Bowles, former Ambassador to India, said that he had never met a Russian in that country who was not working hard at Hindi, or already reasonably flu-

ent in the language. American officials who are fluent in Hindi could comfortably meet in the living room of an average American home.

What are the results? When Moscow contracted to build the Bhilai steel mill for India, a great many of the Russians, from steel muddlers to top engineers, could speak to Indians in their own language. The Indians were so pleased that they did not object when Russian workers taught Russian and Marxist doctrine to Indian workers during the lunch hour.

In Swahili, Nepali, Telugu, Annamese, Amharic—languages spoken by 86 million people—the pattern is the same. The Soviets have platoons of people trained in all these languages. Most Russians will not see duty overseas, but if the need arises, the Soviet propaganda apparatus can call upon an immense reservoir of language competence. By contrast, consider that this year only four of our foreign service officers are studying southeast Asian languages.

But the real cutting edge of the Soviet propaganda apparatus is the full-time, highly trained expert who skillfully directs his army of assistants. When he goes to work, overseas or in Moscow, he will have survived one of the world's most rigorous indoctrination and screening programs. He is a professional who has been schooled more extensively than a physician. Take, as a composite example, the case of a fellow we'll call Serge Rasonilkov.

Serge was graduated at the top of his class from a high school in Minsk. He was assigned to one of the numerous institutes that exist throughout Russia for specialized training in language and area studies. For the first year the average workday was 16 to 18 hours. Serge was 1 of 25 students making up a class in Twi, a little-known language which is spoken by 2 million people in the northern part of Africa's gold coast region. Language made up one-half of the institute's program, and it was taught by an African Communist, specially recruited. The other half of the curriculum consisted of an intensive course in the anthropology, religion, politics, and geography of Africa.

At the end of the first year the 25 students were told where each ranked in the class. The bottom five students were dropped from the institute.

For 36 more months the work continued. When the class finally was graduated, it consisted only of five superior professionals. The Russians' estimates of their need for experts in Twi were five per year. Two of the students had been discharged from the institute for "marriage without official permission." The rest were casualties of the competitive system. In addition to scholastic brilliance, other criteria were taken into consideration in grading students—physical stamina, ability to make decisions and boldness.

Serge was one of those who survived. Serge had acquired not only the ability to speak Twi fluently but also knowledge of the Twi folk myths. In addition he knew the names of contemporary political leaders in the areas where Twi was spoken, their backgrounds, their weaknesses.

A few months before being graduated from the institute Serge and the four other surviving students were each assigned a secret topic on which to write a master's thesis. Unbeknownst to any of the five the topics were identical—"A Marxist-Leninist Strategy for Twi-speaking Cultures: The Next 10 Years." Near the end of the term each student was presented with a copy of the other four theses and asked to defend his own publicly in the light of what the other stated. To Western educators such a technique would be not only unethical but extremely cruel. In the Soviet view it produces a potential diplomat-propagandist who is suspicious, tough minded and highly flexible in his application of Communist ideology.

The institute decided that Serge was their most outstanding graduate. The four other graduates were at once ordered to Twi-speaking areas of Africa where they took jobs in the Russian Embassy or consulates as chauffeurs, kitchen helpers, and messengers. They were given these jobs to permit extensive contact with the natives. Later they would move into propaganda jobs.

Serge remained in Moscow and was sent to the Diplomatic School for an additional 2 years. The U.S.S.R. Diplomatic School is top secret. No American, to our knowledge, has ever visited there. A few foreign Communists have briefly attended the school and after defecting from the party have described what takes place in that highly guarded institution.

The first task of the school is to instill in every student an identical notion of the grand sweep of Soviet strategy and tactical flexibility. The aim of that strategy is to assure the world domination of socialism. Tactical flexibility means that in each country, at some time in history, the ever-changing problems will be different and must be handled differently. In some countries it will be possible to move quickly—to give history a push. In others it will be necessary to go more slowly, to mask Soviet intentions, to work in feigned sympathy with unsatisfactory local movements.

Serge also was taught such practical skills as the art of "spontaneous demonstration." The antiriot procedures of police all over the world were carefully studied so that they could be circumvented. Serge personally will never participate in such a demonstration. But he will give the triggering order to the local Communist leaders. The Communists, for example, carefully controlled the pitch and tempo of the Zengakuren student demonstration against the Japanese visit of President Eisenhower. The Communists in Tokyo, vastly outnumbered in the Zengakuren organization by moderates and conservatives, maneuvered the others during the last 3 days before the President's scheduled visit. The result of this tactic was a stunning historical cataclysm. The sovereign head of the world's most powerful Nation was prevented from visiting another head of state. To this day most of the members of the Zengakuren who howled in the streets during those days, are not anti-American and are not quite sure how they were manipulated. For Serge, such a performance is a routine technique.

A former Communist once told us, we thought jokingly, that one of the things taught at the Diplomatic School was "the moment for producing the proletarian corpse." By this the ex-Communist meant the technique of mysteriously killing or wounding a well-known native leader—especially one in revolt against white officials. The result of the murder usually is a violent flareup of native rage against those in authority. To succeed in such a political maneuver requires great skill. One of the problems of the propagandist is to calculate accurately when the moment for the murder has arrived—and how to have the corpse "discovered" most effectively.

In recent years we are not so certain that our ex-Communist friend was joking. With an eerie consistency, political deaths around the world inflame insurrections and benefit the Communists. From Laos to Vietnam to the Congo there is a thin, red, bloody strand that is almost surely not accidental.

Upon completion of his studies at the Diplomatic School, Serge was ordered to a Soviet embassy in Africa, where he at once had a consultation with the Russian political boss. In most Soviet embassies the ambassador is not the "No. 1 man" but is only a figurehead. He is the one charged with the energy-consuming task of showing up at social functions. If the ambassador absorbs

a staggering number of vodka toasts and a huge amount of caviar at such functions, he can spend the next day recovering. The important political work is done by others who have time to think and study. Usually the real leader of the embassy will occupy what is officially the third or fourth position.

Serge was given almost a completely free hand. The camouflaged "No. 1" said he would issue specific orders only when a change in tactics or strategy came down from Moscow.

At first Serge concentrated on influencing strategically placed persons. Serge also saw that Twi poets, writers and intellectuals had their work translated and reviewed by Tass and in Pravda, or in one of the many specialized journals within Russia. The reviews invariably glowed with praise. Serge made certain that the local intellectual received a Twi translation of the review—as well as substantial royalties.

In the second phase Serge generated an impression of great Soviet admiration for the folk culture of the host country. The Soviet press published editorials insisting that selected native intellectuals be invited to Russia as state guests. Such visits were lavishly prepared and widely reported.

In Russia the surprised Africans found themselves surrounded by people who were not only friendly but apparently genuinely interested in the culture of their own country. Writers who had barely been making a living suddenly began to receive handsome checks from Moscow for work that was translated into Russian. Musicians and artists received the same heady attention.

We once asked a group of Asian intellectuals, all of whom had received royalty payments from Moscow, if they knew that no American or British writer was able to receive royalties for works published in Russia. There was an embarrassing silence. We asked, half jokingly, how many of them would be willing to return their royalty checks to Moscow as a gesture of solidarity with their American literary colleagues.

One of the Asians, more candid than the others, stated, "It is impossible. I am now dependent for approximately 50 percent of my income on Soviet royalties. I could not afford to do as you ask, and I am ashamed of that fact." Most of the writers professed to be unaffected politically by their Soviet incomes.

But a young Indonesian writer told us, "It is difficult to avoid unconscious seduction. The first few articles I wrote for the Communists were fair and objective, and they printed them precisely as I wrote them. Each time they paid me more than I had received before. After a few months, however, they began to suggest slight editorial changes: Would I object to the placing of the word 'imperialistic' before 'American'; would it not be accurate to describe Eisenhower, a former general, as a militarist? If I balked they quietly went along, but they kept the pressure on—partly by raising the payments. One day I finished an article and on rereading realized that it was straight Communist doctrine. I tore it up and have not written for the Communists since."

He is a rare exception. But let us return to Serge.

Serge's next step was an intensive program of cultural exchange. Here Serge took Japan as an example. In 1957 a distinguished Russian pianist, Gilels, made a Japanese tour. This was quickly followed by a tour of the singer, Alla Glenskova. In 1958 the Russians invited the Japanese puppet theater Avidz to Russia, where it received wildly enthusiastic reviews. The Russians also made it known, pointedly, that this was the first trip that the puppeteers had made outside of Japan's borders. Scholars, scientists and famous Russian artists too numerous to mention all visited Japan. In return,

numerous groups of Japanese were invited to visit Russia.

Japan is a fully developed society, and Japanese are likely to recognize propaganda techniques when they see them. Even so, the Russians have made a serious propaganda penetration and are constantly working hard to enlarge it.

In the primitive and emerging nations the Soviet effort is proportionately much higher. Communist entertainers and artists and journalists flood to countries like Liberia, the Sudan, Ethiopia, Iran, Lebanon, and all the Arab countries.

In Burma, Russian circuses and Chinese entertainers went to tiny upcountry hamlets where the people had never before seen a foreigner. In some cases the Russian circus staff was larger than the village population.

Serge followed the established propaganda pattern closely. Once key people are cultivated and a mask of friendliness exhibited to the masses, the propaganda dagger is aimed at other victims. The next target group is students. They are invited to fairs, youth festivals, cultural meetings, and universities—all in Russia. Preparations are carefully made. For example, student delegations arriving in Russia from France and Great Britain and the United States, who have some knowledge of Communist techniques and are therefore likely to be suspicious, are housed in drab, ordinary dormitories. But the delegations from Africa, the Arab countries, and southeast Asia are housed and fed in plush luxury—candlelighted tables, a menu meticulously put together with careful attention to religious requirements and native food tastes, and cheerful waiters.

Perhaps the high point in the propagandizing of students took place in 1960 when Khrushchev, while visiting in Indonesia, announced that the Soviet Union had established a University of Friendship of the Peoples. This university is designed to train engineers, physicians, teachers, and technical experts from all over the world. If successful, it might make it possible for communism to capture the intellectual elite of most of the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Fortunately the first few classes did not go well. But the Russians are experimenting; the curriculum of the Friendship University has just been changed.

The countless festivals and youth congresses in the Soviet Union are carefully and generously subsidized. Students from the poor nations pay little or nothing. But the Soviet aid is always carefully presented as a fellowship or as a reward for winning a contest or some such face-saving device.

Once an atmosphere of friendliness is established with the intellectual elite and the organization of students in underdeveloped countries is underway, the next step is a careful wooing of the leaders. With a shrewd eye for protocol, the Russians first send a high-ranking diplomat to call on leaders such as Sukarno, Haile Selassie, Nehru, or the Shah of Iran. The foreign head of government is then invited to the Soviet Union. There is no limit to costs.

Take the visit of Nasser, the ruler of Egypt, to Russia. He was flown in a luxuriously equipped Soviet jetliner, the TU-104. When he arrived in Moscow, he was greeted by orderly files of people cheering as he drove down the street. Scrubbed schoolchildren threw flowers at him wherever he went. At small, intimate parties Nasser was shown examples of Egyptian and Arabic works translated into Russian, some of them consisting of his own speeches, which had been catalogued as "masterpieces." He met Soviet Moslems who had made the pilgrimage to Mecca. While traveling in Russia he was shown factories making the most sophisticated military equipment, parts for guided missiles and earth-moving equipment. The

implication was clear: The Soviet Union was not only powerful in war but able to supply the kind of equipment needed to build the Aswan Dam; and she could supply seed and farm machinery for the lands to be irrigated by that dam.

At a splendid state dinner Khrushchev assured Nasser of the support of "the whole Socialist world" in his "struggle for independence." Nasser was also informed that the Soviets had just established a Society for Friendship and Cultural Relations With the Countries of the Arab East.

The usual concluding flourish to such a trip is making a gift of the jet plane in which the foreign leader has traveled. Haile Selassie, the Shah of Iran and Sukarno have received such gifts. U Nu of Burma flies in a plane presented by the Russians. The Russians pay special attention to local customs. They know, for example, that Indonesians prefer lengthy movies. The longer the show, the more the Indonesians like it. It is no accident that President Sukarno exhibited the 3-hour motion picture of his trip to Russia in preference to the 30-minute movie documentation of his visit to America made by our U.S. Information Agency.

The foreign leader, thus manipulated, sometimes leaves the Soviet Union with the impression not only that the Russians are deeply interested in his country, but that Russia is the coming economic and military power. No one lectured him on the "inevitability of world communism." He has met the real leaders of Russia and may have the impression that he can "do business with the Russians" without compromising his position.

The results are alarming. Today in Egypt there are thousands of Soviet technicians, military advisers and engineers. Instruction in the Russian language has begun in secondary schools of the United Arab Republic. Three hundred of her best students are being sent annually to Russia to study.

Now Russia is ready for the last stage of propaganda: "the socialization of the masses." This means a penetrating and widespread propagandization of the citizens of a foreign country. The blueprint of action is clear. In most of the emerging countries where Serge—and a thousand others like him—serves, the public communication system is either primitive or nonexistent. One of Serge's first steps in socializing the masses will be to see that small radios are distributed to the outlying villages by the native Communist Party. These radios have one peculiarity: They receive only one station—Radio Moscow or Radio Peking. Powerful broadcasting stations in Russia and China fill the air with programs in Amoy, Tonkinese, Tibetan, Pashto, Bengali, Berber and hundreds of other languages. In deserts, deltas, and farm areas the entire population of tiny hamlets will squat around the radio in the evening hours. As the young people crank the hand generator, the village listens to Bing Crosby, the Red Army Chorus, classical music, folk music of their own land—and a carefully edited version of world news. American press reports are rewritten to make us look as bad and unhappy as possible.

The Communists also realize that intense "literacy drives" among the emerging nations creates a new market for books, magazines and newspapers. Today the Russians and Chinese are the biggest publishers of books in the world. Between them they produce more than 2 billion books a year, which surpasses the entire output of all other nations. A large fraction of these volumes are published in foreign languages, ranging from obscure African languages, like Fang-Bulu and Kabyle, to Japanese and German. Children's books which successfully convert Cinderella and Little Red Rid-

ing Hood into Communist heroes are put out in fine editions, beautifully illustrated. Millions of magazines are distributed throughout the world, each of them aimed at a specific audience: the peasant, the trade union member, the city worker, the disgruntled intellectual.

Today the world's best-selling author is Joseph Stalin. His books are followed by the Bible, but the next three most widely read authors are Communists. A bookseller in Cairo or Djakarta or Bangkok or Singapore finds it financially attractive to stock Communist literature. First, he pays for the books in the local currency, directly to the Russian or Chinese Embassy. Second, their cost is low and the profit is high.

The accumulated local currency resulting from local payments is used by officials like Serge to establish native newspapers and journals. Normally there will be an overt Communist newspaper, which concentrates on lengthy analyses of Marxist theory. It is usually turgid and has a small circulation. But Communist money also flows to the covert newspapers. They carry neutral titles such as the Star, or the Chronicle and are jammed with popular features attracting a mass circulation. With no visible Communist connections, these papers carry on bitter campaigns against white colonialism and the presence of American troops overseas.

Hand in hand with books and newspapers, the Communists have been engaged since 1955 in a stepped-up production of motion pictures. Among other advantages, use of this medium assures that illiterates are not overlooked. In 5 years the number of Communist propaganda films has quadrupled.

Serge is familiar with all these techniques. He has the personnel and assets to use instantly whatever method he judges most effective. Serge can order any Russian in the area to take on a propaganda project; and each receives a specific assignment in addition to his normal job. Whatever money or equipment is needed Serge can get quickly from Moscow. Films, money, printing presses, newsprint, books, a grand ballet—these will be flown in at his request. The Russian Government is organized for this kind of operation. The propaganda agency in the U.S.S.R. has a status equal to that of the Foreign Service or Department of Defense.

There is only one thing Serge may not do: He may not fail. If he makes one major mistake, he is ruined. He will be recalled and placed in a minor post for life. The same applies to everyone involved in Russian strategy and tactics.

Compared with the Communist effort the American venture into propaganda is anemic. Not only is the USIA budget severely limited, but so is its statutory function. It can only project the American image abroad. It is paradoxical that America, where the communications arts are most highly developed and where the technical skills are so far advanced, should be such a slow starter.

Our USIA people are on the whole as intelligent and perceptive as their Russian counterparts. But they are paralyzed by inadequate funds, too frequent shifts in posts, and sketchy training in the language and customs of the area they serve.

The Communists are not infallible. They have made great mistakes. Their ruthless suppression of the Hungarians, the inhumanity of the collective farms in China, and other events have nullified many of their propaganda drives. Then, too, the Soviet Friendship University is by all accounts a dismal place that offends many students. Yet few Asians or Africans are aware of these facts. All in all, the Russians make more mistakes than Americans do. But the Communists have the funds, trained personnel, and organization to take advantage of—or create—American fumbles. We are slow to act.

There is nothing at this moment to prevent Americans from creating the intellectual and technical weapons required to win the great battle for exposing the minds of men to the truth. The Communists already have a formidable machine at work telling lies. Americans can overcome it. All that is lacking at the moment is an awareness of the danger and a determination to do something about it.

Centennial of Masonry in Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, during the week of August 2 Colorado Masonry held meetings throughout the State commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the fraternity within the State. This great fraternity has rendered outstanding and effective service to mankind. This has been particularly so as it has grown in the United States, with its lodges coming into existence and flourishing throughout this great land of ours.

In Colorado some of our great public servants and leaders have been members of this fraternal organization, and at all times its members have endeavored, and have succeeded, in building constructively for the good of the State and its people.

On August 2, in Grand Junction, Colo., members of the two Masonic lodges of that community met to celebrate this anniversary. On that occasion my personal friend and Masonic brother of many years, James K. Groves, gave a splendid address. I take pleasure in having it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that its historic and educational values may be preserved:

CENTENNIAL OF MASONRY IN COLORADO—MESA
No. 55, A.F. & A.M., AUGUST 2, 1961

(An address by James K. Groves)

Worshipful master and brothers, some time ago our competent and efficient secretary handed me an address, which I presume was issued by the grand lodge, designed to be given on this occasion. I was told that I could read it as it is, modify it, or throw it away and give one of my own composition. It is a good address but, with my stubbornness and independence, what follows are portions of it and materials that I have inserted. Therefore, you will know that in these remarks, when I am saying something that is meaningful or of interest, it comes from the grand lodge address, and when dull and inappropriate, it has resulted from my own peregrinations.

We meet here this evening with the other 166 lodges of this grand lodge, united in one common purpose—the celebration of the formation 100 years ago tonight in Golden City, Colorado Territory, of the Grand Lodge, A.F. & A.M., Colorado, attended by 67 members of the three lodges there represented.

Each of us, I believe, has or has had a copy of George B. Clark's book, "Our Masonic Heritage." On an occasion such as this it should not be inappropriate to trace from it the Masonic genealogy which lead to that meeting on August 2, 1861. Near the beginning of Masonry in the Americas, there were the Grand Lodges of Virginia and North

Carolina. The first local lodge was established in Virginia, December 22, 1733, and lodges there were organized subsequently under the jurisdiction of the Premier Grand Lodge of England, the Grand Lodge of Scotland, the Kelwinning Lodge of Edinburgh, Scotland, and the Provincial Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania. It was the latter which issued the charter to Alexandria Lodge No. 22 which selected George Washington as its first master. On October 13, 1778, these lodges of Virginia duly proclaimed the Grand Lodge of Virginia. During approximately the same period lodges were being organized in the Colony of North Carolina, under the authority of the Premier Grand Lodge of England. On St. John's Day, December 27, 1787, the nine lodges of the Colony of North Carolina organized the Grand Lodge of North Carolina. Without relating dates and details, these two grand lodges issued charters in other areas from which grand lodges were formed, which new grand lodges repeated the operation and, as a result, there flowed from the Grand Lodges of Virginia and North Carolina the authority for the Grand Lodges of Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska, the last of which was organized, the latest, on September 23, 1857.

The three lodges in the territory of Colorado, which shortly prior thereto was Jefferson Territory, being the lodges at Golden City, Parkville, and Gold Hill, had been chartered, one from Kansas and two from Nebraska. Thus it can be seen that our Colorado Grand Lodge and, in turn, we of this lodge, have gained our heritage from the roots of this Nation.

Let us back up just a little beyond 100 years ago tonight and look at the area involved. Prior to August 2, 1861, this land we now term colorful Colorado had belonged in turn to the Indians, Spain, Louisiana, Missouri, Republic of Texas, Mexico, New Mexico, Utah, Nebraska, and Kansas. Earlier in the year 1861 it was Jefferson Territory, a unit without any local or territorial government and subject entirely to the orders and appointees from Washington.

Ten years following the discovery of gold in California in 1848, which gave rise to the 49'ers, and in 1858, gold was discovered in the Rockies of Jefferson Territory and the cry of "Pike's Peak or Bust" was in the air, as well as on many occasions the subsequent, plaintive sign "Busted, by God." By the fall of 1858 the vanguard of prospectors and miners had reached Cherry Creek. On November 4, 1858, seven Masons gathered in the tent of Henry Allen and, while they did not have a formal meeting, they discussed Masonry and contemplated the application for charter. This was in the new town called Auraria. Not too far away was Denver City, a city with a population of 300, all living in tents except that there was one cabin. In his four-volume "History of Colorado and Its People," LeRoy R. Hafen records that a couple of weeks prior to this first informal Masonic meeting in Denver City, there met in this one cabin the organizers of the Denver Town Co. The cabin belonged to Wm. McGaugh. He was most hospitable, serving a kettleful of hot punch which was brewed from Mexican whisky known at that time as Taos lightning. A man named Frank Hall kept the minutes of the meeting and the minutes record that after considerable discussion and hospitality, "It is proper to draw a veil over the final deliberations of the meeting." Apparently the organizers met on another day, soberly, and completed the organization of the townsite of Denver City.

It was a rough country between 1858 and 1861. Indians would become drunk and commit many massacres and other depredations. The historians record that a majority of the bloody murders of the period which were blamed on Indians were really committed by white men. They further record

that what sane local government there was, was at the instigation primarily of the minority of Masons in the various mining camps. Prices were a bit strange. A whole venison sold dressed for \$1.25, and yet 100 pounds of flour cost \$40. Some of the early issues of the Rocky Mountain News carried the barbershop ad: "Come and get your hair and beard mowed." And as one entered the shop, he would see a card with the following message:

"Since man to man will be unjust,
You may bet your pile we never trust."

The currency of the period consisted of \$10 and \$20 gold pieces, minted by Clark, Gruber & Co. They were soft and disintegrated rapidly, being of nearly pure gold and having no alloy. A carpenter's union was formed in one of the camps and established an unheard of wage for the time of \$3 a day plus board. A. O. McGrew, known as the wheelbarrow man because he came in the "Pikes Peak or Bust" rush wheeling a wheelbarrow, plastered the region with reams of his verse. Here is a fair sample:

"Way out upon the Platte, near Pikes Peak
we were told,
There, by a little digging, we could get a
pile of gold.
So we bundled up our duds, resolved at
least to try
And tempt old Madame Fortune, root hog,
or die.
Speculation is the fashion even at this
early stage,
And corner lots and boom talk appear to
be the rage.
The emigration's bound to come; to greet
them we will try,
Big pig, little pig, root hog or die."

In April 1861 the Southern States announced their secession and on April 12 that year their occurred the firing on Fort Sumter which precipitated the Civil War. Immediately prior to that time the formation of the territory of Colorado had been announced with its first capital at Colorado City, described as being northeast of Canyon City and which, as you know, comprised a part of what is now Colorado Springs. President Lincoln had appointed Maj. William Gilpin of Missouri as the first Governor of the Colorado Territory. On April 24, 1861, word reached Denver City of the Civil War and Confederate flags were unfurled in the streets and upon the buildings, but were quickly torn down with considerable fighting. The next day in Denver City a huge bonfire was lighted and a mass meeting called, whereupon the following resolutions were adopted by this wild and wooly community:

"Whereas, in all times past it hath been the privilege of a free people peaceably to assemble and freely express themselves on public matters; and whereas this people, though far removed from the strong arm of our National Government, yet feeling a deep interest and love for their distracted country, and fearing lest they, by silence, might be misunderstood, would therefor, irrespective of past political predilections: Firmly
"Resolved, That, as for Colorado, she, with willing hearts and ready feet, will follow the flag and keep step to the music of the Union;

"Resolved, That the Government of Washington is good enough for us—that it is the best Government the world ever saw—that we will ever sustain it;

"Resolved, That the rich inheritance of constitutional liberty—our forefathers, living, fought for and secured, and dying, blessed—we, their sons, should maintain at any hazard—even unto death;

"Resolved, That the flag of the Colorado Territory is the Star Spangled Banner;

"Resolved, That we desire peace in our midst, and that each one of us will exert

himself to preserve peace and harmony in this Territory, among our fellow citizens, because we love peace, and lest we may have need of all for common defense against the Indian tribes around us."

Colorado was on the Union side, but bear in mind for whatever it may be worth that the grand lodge to be formed that same fall had its roots in two of the Confederate States.

On May 27, 1861, Governor Gilpin arrived in Denver. There is a long article in the issue of the Rocky Mountain News of May 28, 1861, of the welcome accorded him and the many speeches made. I chuckled at one paragraph:

"Hon. H. P. Bennet [who was to become the first delegate to Congress from Colorado Territory] came forward and introduced Governor Gilpin to the assemblage, prefacing with a polished and patriotic little speech. * * * Governor Gilpin responded in a somewhat lengthy speech, and in a style and manner which seemed to suit and satisfy all parties present. His remarks were clearly and cautiously composed, not committing himself on anything, yet assuring and inspiring the hearers with the feeling of being interested and impartially devoted toward all the sections and the citizens of our Territory; and of being loyal and sound toward the Union and the Constitution."

In June 1861, there assembled the first Territorial Legislature of Colorado and the first Supreme Court which Court handed down decisions in that raw and rugged time which are still precedents in our life here in Colorado today.

As previously mentioned, on August 2 of that year 67 members of 3 lodges met in Golden City.

There were not automobiles, in fact there were no roads. There was no television, no radio, no telephones, no telegraph communication. That man could ever fly through the air seemed but an idle dream. This was the year of the pony express, that rapid form of mail service which promised to revolutionize our communications, but the pony express lasted only a short while and only touched the territory of Colorado at the extreme northeast corner near Julesburg. In 1861, although man had trod the earth for untold centuries, he still moved across the land at a pace no more rapid than a Caesar or an ancient Pharaoh. In 1861 when Masons went to lodge they guided their steps by kerosene lanterns. The hall was lighted by candles or oil-burning lamps just as they had been for centuries past. It is interesting to note that the price of a gallon of kerosene in those days often exceeded that of a gallon of whisky.

At each side of the entrance to the massive Archives Building in our Nation's Capital is an inscription. One has these words: "Study the past" and the other "The past is prologue." As we meet here this evening in the midst of all that makes life comfortable and as we stand upon the threshold of a brandnew age—the atomic age—we can say in the words of the taxi driver who was explaining these inscriptions to his passenger: "Mister, that means you ain't seen nothin' yet."

This brings to mind the story of the man from Cape Canaveral who went to Washington, D.C., for the first time and, when standing awe-struck before the Washington Monument, was heard to mutter "By gosh, they'll never get it off the ground!"

As we meet here this evening there are U.S. B-52's flying on alert in various parts of the country and the world, each one of which on the average carries 12 times as much explosive power as all the bombs dropped in World War II, including atomic bombs. Tonight enough nuclear weapons now exist in American stockpiles to exterminate every man, woman and child on earth, and the Soviet Union has almost as many.

Each nation is spending billions on means of delivering these weapons. If the United States and the Soviet Union should engage in a nuclear war, within a few weeks—in the so-called first and second strikes—between 60 and 90 percent of the population of both countries would be killed, and the survivors would have been spared to see horrors even more unimaginable than this quick killing of hundreds of millions of people.

Many are the new tools which the hands of man have grasped in recent years. So great has been the demonstration of his ability to bring into being the products of his imagination and dreams that it is difficult for us to realize that so many of these miraculous developments have occurred within the lifetime of those present here this evening. When we turn, however, from the tangible to the intangible, from the material to the spiritual side of the life of man, we find that thoughtful men are disturbed over the fact that our civilization is lagging in spiritual progress. It is true that our present-day civilization can cite many instances of great spiritual growth but it sometimes seems that for every claim of progress there exists an opposing condition to counteract and nullify our claims. We profess a belief in the dignity of the individual man—that we are all children of one common father—and yet intolerance of one race for another is rampant in our land. It brings to mind the story that went the rounds not too long ago about the fellow here in a bar in Grand Junction who, upon becoming rather exuberant, pounded the bar and said, "There are two things I hate—intolerance and niggers."

Men no longer rot in filthy dungeons as in days of yore, our penal institutions are vastly improved, but we are a long way from solving the problem of rehabilitation of our social outcasts.

New and larger churches are springing up everywhere. People are attending churches as never before, but our rate of crime is increasing steadily.

We go to great expense in educating our youth. As Masons we take great pride in our allied groups of young men and women, but accounts of juvenile delinquency continue to be discouraging and disheartening.

We loudly proclaim the right of man to the freedoms guaranteed in the Constitution for these United States of America, but seem always willing to trade that freedom piece by piece for something we call security.

We believe implicitly in our American and Masonic way of life, but are indifferent to the affairs of our own Government and apathetic toward those great insidious forces which would destroy us. About 2 months ago, along with some of you, I listened at a noon luncheon club to a talk by Bernard Teets, the head of the State Employment Department. He told of an act of Congress passed a month before which causes to be spent over a billion dollars in additional unemployment benefits to those receiving them from the States, without regard to the situation or need of the recipients. He asked that those who had heard of this legislation, which admittedly is of some importance, to hold up their hands. Out of over 100 business and professional men present, 3 held up their hands.

During the past century men have universally accepted the maxim of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, but have exemplified it by fighting no less than 22 wars.

We stand indicted by instances of man's inhumanity to man and are compelled to ask ourselves as we face the second century of our existence: Does Freemasonry have anything to offer to society in a rapidly shrinking world? Can it be of assistance facing the problems confronting him in a rapidly changing world? We believe that it does

and can. We believe that values and ideals have not become obsolete because of material progress or exterminated by crime or devastation of war. We are persuaded that the great principles promulgated by our ancient craft, having stood the test in the crucible of time, will be just as essential in the century ahead as they have for centuries past.

Freemasonry today as never before speaks to the world a message of universality. It has been the one great force in which has been found a common ground whereon men may meet religiously, socially, and morally; thus it can offer to civilization in the century that lies ahead, that pattern of human conduct which is the one great hope of man.

And so, my brethren, we may rest assured that as we stand upon the threshold of a new century of Masonry in Colorado there is still a great work for our ancient craft which has ever sought to promote the dignity of the individual man; which is now, as it always has been, the unalterable foe of any creed or ideology which seeks to enslave the minds of men and which clings fast to the doctrine of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. For in the words of Edwin C. Markham:

"We are all blind until we see
That in the human plan
Nothing is worth the making if
It does not make the man."

It would seem entirely fitting and proper that any discourse upon this occasion should conclude with a tribute to those great men who were the pioneers of Masonry in this raw, new land 100 years ago today. They came, most of them, in the slow, monotonous covered wagon. Through midday heat and wintry winds they wended their way for months from far-off places. They brought with them materials for their Masonic altars and set them in the wilderness. Upon them they placed the Holy Bible, symbol of man's faith; upon the book they placed the square, symbol of equality before the law, and the compasses, emblematical of that due restraint upon personal liberty necessary for the protection of the rights of others.

They worked with rough hands and stout hearts to bring order out of chaos and from the woof of time wove the lasting fabric of justice and good government. They labored long and diligently to lay the foundation upon which the elegant superstructure of Colorado Masonry has been erected. May we so live and work that their labors will not have been in vain. The torch they bore has been handed to us. It is our duty to hold it high; that Freemasonry may continue to shed its beneficent influence upon mankind, that it may continue to be a great force for good in the lives and in the hearts of men.

"And so I say a sacred trust
Is yours to share, is yours to keep;
I hear the voice of men of dust;
I hear the step of men asleep;
And down the endless future, too,
Your own shall echo after you."

State Taxation on the Income of Non-Residents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the problem of State taxation of the income of nonresidents is plaguing the resi-

dents of Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York. The problem is not local and affects many other States. A treatise on the subject which was lucid, informative and exhaustive, recently came to my attention. It was so detailed and covered the problem so well that I believe the readers would appreciate reading this paper written by Lawrence R. Caruso of Princeton University, which was published in a recent issue of the Rutgers Law Review. The treatise follows:

STATE TAXATION OF THE INCOME OF NONRESIDENTS: A NEW JERSEY DILEMMA

(By Lawrence R. Caruso)

I. THE PROBLEM

This article covers one aspect of the overall problem of conflicting or multiple taxation. For purposes of study, the problem may be limited in two ways. First, it may be limited with respect to the type of taxing jurisdictions which impose the conflicting taxes. The most common conflicts involve: (1) the Federal Government and a foreign government, (2) the Federal Government and the States, (3) two or more States, and (4) increasingly, a local government and a State government or other local governments. Secondly, the problem may be limited with respect to the kind of tax involved. In earlier days it frequently involved death taxes, or tangible and intangible personal property taxes. More recently attention has tended to focus on income taxes, both on corporations and on individuals. This article is limited to the single aspect of the problem as it involves conflicting individual or personal income taxes where two or more States are involved.

II. THE BASIC ISSUES

At the turn of the century a number of States still carried on their statute books the personal income tax laws enacted during and following the Civil War. These were flat-rate taxes administered by local property tax officials. A new era of income taxation began in 1911, when Wisconsin adopted an income tax on individuals and corporations and vested responsibility for its administration in a State tax commission. This income tax provided for personal exemptions and graduated rates and was quickly copied by a number of other States.

At present, 32 States and the District of Columbia impose individual income taxes. They were adopted by the States and the District of Columbia as follows: Wisconsin, 1911; Mississippi, 1912; Oklahoma, 1915; Massachusetts, 1916; Virginia, 1916; Delaware, 1917; Missouri, 1917; New York, 1919; North Dakota, 1919; North Carolina, 1921; South Carolina, 1922; New Hampshire, 1923; Arkansas, 1929; Georgia, 1929; Tennessee, 1929; Idaho, 1931; Oregon, 1931; Utah, 1931; Vermont, 1931; Alabama, 1933; Arizona, 1933; Kansas, 1933; Minnesota, 1933; Montana, 1933; New Mexico, 1933; Iowa, 1934; Louisiana, 1934; California, 1935; Kentucky, 1936; Colorado, 1937; Maryland, 1937; District of Columbia, 1939; and Alaska, 1958. An increasing number of States have patterned their methods of income tax computation after the methods used by the Federal Government subsequent to the adoption of a tax simplification program in 1944.

Income taxes provide about one-sixth of State tax revenues. In 1953, nine States derived 25 percent or more of their total tax revenues from individual and corporation income taxes. By 1959, the latest year for which figures currently are available, 13 States derived 25 percent or more of their total tax revenues from individual and corporation income taxes. Obviously, then, despite the fact that no State has established an individual income tax in more than 20 years, except Alaska, which became a State

on June 30, 1958, the income tax (both on individuals and corporations) is continuing to grow in importance in those States which do use it.

The three States which in the past relied most heavily on income taxes were New York, Oregon, and Wisconsin, which in 1958 obtained from individual and corporation income taxes 50 percent, 48 percent, and 46 percent, respectively, of their total tax revenues. Six years later, although the ranking had changed, it still was the same three States and Delaware which placed the most reliance on the income tax. In 1959 Oregon, New York, Delaware, and Wisconsin obtained from individual and corporation income taxes 53 percent, 52 percent, 47 percent, and 44 percent, respectively, of their total tax revenues. These same four States, and Alaska and Massachusetts, secure more than 30 percent of their total tax revenues from the individual income tax alone. In all, a total of 12 States derive more than 20 percent of their total tax revenues from the individual or personal income tax. Thus, the income tax, and especially the individual income tax, is a matter of major importance in the government and administration of many States.

Legislatures often are faced with the situation in which large numbers of nonresidents work in a State or a particular part of a State or, conversely, where large numbers of residents work outside the State. Obviously each group receives benefits from the State. Thus, it is plainly unfair to others who are taxpayers in the State to allow these groups to escape all tax obligations to the State. Two 1920 decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States clarified the jurisdictional bases upon which a State may tax the income of a nonresident. Before that time it had been held that the due process clause of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution denies general tax jurisdiction over subjects not regarded as within a State's boundaries. In *Shaffer v. Carter* the Supreme Court sustained the Oklahoma income tax imposed upon the income of an Illinois resident derived from an oil business and the operation of oil and gas mining leases in Oklahoma. In *Travis v. Yale & Towne Mfg. Co.*, in a decision announced the same day as the Shaffer decision, the Supreme Court recognized the jurisdiction of New York to impose an income tax upon the salaries and wages earned in New York by residents of Connecticut and New Jersey. The shift in doctrine relating to State taxation problems, manifested by the Supreme Court as a tribunal of final resort, is toward an expanding recognition of freedom on the part of the States in the imposition and collection of taxes.

Quite a few States clearly exhibit the desire to extend their taxing jurisdiction as far as the Supreme Court will allow and to tax everything the Supreme Court will allow. The continuing search for more revenue thus is steadily increasing the extent of tax overlapping. Tax overlapping or multiple or conflicting taxation occurs where two or more jurisdictions tax the same object, as where the State of one's residence and the State of one's employment (if different) both tax one's income. The problem of conflicting taxation began to receive serious attention as early as the mid-1930's. At that time, however, attention tended to be focused on taxes other than the income tax. In an excellent article on multiple State taxation, published as recently as 17 years ago, for example, the personal or individual income tax was not even mentioned. The situation has changed. Today a substantial share of the attention paid to the entire problem relates to the income tax. The ill effects of excessive duplication and overlapping in taxes may be summarized as follows:

1. They may result in undue concentration of tax charges on a narrow range of

economic activity. This may distort the whole pattern of investment and employment.

2. They limit the degree to which State governments have freedom in securing revenue sources to meet their needs.

3. They increase the cost of administration of collecting the taxes.

4. They irritate and annoy the taxpayer who is already heavily burdened by the obligation to pay. He has to face double or triple tax-reporting systems.

5. They reduce efficiency in the operation of State government due to a duplication of administration and responsibility.

III. DEDUCTIBILITY AND CREDITS

To be taxable, income of nonresidents derived from professional and personal services must definitely be attributable to activity within the taxing state. If income is derived partly from services rendered outside the State, income from outside source may not be included in the income subject to tax. Some States make some effort to relieve the nonresident taxpayer of the burden of multiple State taxation of the same income. Although there is hardly a tax coordination devise ever thought of that has not been used somewhere or other, help for victims of multiple taxation usually takes the form of tax deductibility or tax credits.

Tax deductibility may be defined as the practice of one jurisdiction in permitting the deduction from the tax base of taxes levied by other jurisdictions; for example, the Federal Government allows the deduction from gross income of State individual and corporate income taxes in determining net income for Federal tax purposes, and some of the States permit similar deduction of Federal taxes. Deductibility has not found much use where the overlapping involves income tax and is between or among States.

Tax credits may be defined as an arrangement under which taxpayers are allowed to claim taxes paid to one jurisdiction as a partial credit against tax liability to another jurisdiction. This devise has been used, for example, by the Federal Government with respect to taxes paid to the States in the field of transfer taxes at death and the unemployment insurance tax. It is much favored when the overlapping involves the income tax of two or more States. Credit often is dependent, however, upon the existence of substantially similar reciprocal legislation in the other State involved in the overlapping. Examples of this type of reciprocal credit are found in such widely separated parts of the country as California, North Carolina, and New York.

Eighteen of the States which levy net income taxes on individuals grant a tax credit for personal income taxes paid to other States. Some of these 18 States allow the credit to residents only, some to nonresidents only, and some to both; so that, in all, 14 States grant such credit to their own residents for taxes paid to other States, and 12 allow credit to nonresidents. No possibility of a double credit exists since, in all States which allow credits, only taxes already paid or at least unconditionally payable may be credited. With regard to credit allowance to nonresidents, all States which grant such credit do so subject to the condition that the tax for which credit is requested has been paid to the taxpayer's State of residence, and not to another State of nonresidence. The legal principle requiring a tax law to be construed against the taxing power and all doubts to be resolved in favor of the taxpayer has no application to the reciprocity provision of a State income tax law granting an exemption from the payment of an income tax. A taxpayer claiming such exemption must show that he comes clearly within its grant.

IV. THE NEW JERSEY DILEMMA

It has been said that there is no comparable industrial State that has so many undeveloped tax bases as New Jersey. Sales taxes and individual income taxes are the largest sources of general tax revenues used in other States but these are not presently included within the New Jersey system of taxes. Although a majority of the States impose individual net income taxes, some of the most populous and highly industrialized States, including New Jersey and Connecticut, have no individual income taxes. During the fiscal year ending March 31, 1957, the State of New York, on the other hand, collected \$476,300,000 in personal income taxes. A substantial part of this sum was collected from 180,000 nonresident taxpayers, 172,000 of whom resided in either New Jersey or Connecticut, 155,000 New Jersey residents paid \$20 million to New York, while 17,000 Connecticut; 155,000 New Jersey residents paid also was a comparatively small number of persons from other States, particularly Pennsylvanians, who earned all or part of their income in New York State and paid the nonresident income tax to New York. Subsequently, a sample study of returns filed for income earned during the calendar year 1957 indicated that there were 201,252 nonresident New York taxpayers, 148,720 of whom were residents of New Jersey. These nonresidents were subject to a total tax of \$38,506,000, with \$24,262,000 coming from New Jersey residents.

The basic reason for difficulty stems from the fact that neither New Jersey nor Connecticut imposes an individual income tax. If they did and if the rates approximated the New York rates, New Jersey and Connecticut residents would pay no or very little New York tax. Because New Jersey and Connecticut do not impose a tax on personal income, or measured by personal income, residents of those States may not take advantage of the reciprocal provisions of the New York tax law. Thus, when they are liable for the New York income tax on personal income which has its source in New York, they may not take any credits for taxes paid to their State of residence. Consequently, they find themselves in the unpleasant position of paying the full measure of taxes to their State of residence, and, because that does not include an individual income tax, also paying the full income tax, without credits, to New York. This hardly seems equitable.

In general, the New York personal income tax law follows the Federal income tax law. There are two important ways, however, in which the New Jersey resident subject to the New York personal income tax finds it even more onerous than does the New York resident. First, a New York resident is permitted to deduct all applicable allowable deductions, but a nonresident is not permitted any of these deductions except to the extent that they are related to the production of income in New York. Secondly, when nonresidents are entitled to refunds with respect to personal income tax paid to New York by way of payroll withholding, 2 to 3 years sometimes elapse before these refunds are made. Also, until very recently, in New York only the nonresident had his New York State personal income tax withheld at the source, by payroll deductions by his employer, while the New York resident did not. As if this were not enough, in 1959 the New York personal income tax law underwent some significant changes. These changes included both a reduction in exemptions and an increase in the upper limit of the rate scale. Both of these changes will tend to increase the burden on nonresident taxpayers.

New Jersey and Connecticut, however, are not alone in their tax dilemma. The Florida "winter resident," for example, frequently finds himself with multistate tax problems. This often occurs in those cases

where he has taken no steps to establish a definite, provable domicile in Florida or to retain a domicile in the State in which he formerly resided. His tax problems more often than not involve taxes other than personal income taxes. And when they do involve personal income taxes the issue usually is the question of what State is his legal residence. This is in marked contrast to the problem of the New Jersey resident working in New York or Philadelphia who knows full well where his residence is, but whose tax problems only begin, not end, at that point.

V. SOME PROPOSED SOLUTIONS TO THE GENERAL PROBLEM

Few would deny that both residents of a State and those nonresidents receiving income from sources within a State have a tax obligation to that State. Differences of opinion arise primarily over the question of the proper way for these two obligations to be discharged.

Those who design the revenue system of a State must always be aware of the relative mobility of persons and property among States. It is this mobility which places the States in a position of actual competition among themselves to provide relatively favorable tax structures. The tax systems of the various States vary so greatly that, as a practical matter, legislators in writing an income tax law must do so in the way which seems to promote best the interests of the State and its people and the demands of equity for them, with little reference to the tax systems of other States. As might be expected, therefore, there is considerable variation among the several State provisions for mitigating interstate double taxation. Mr. Tully, for one, believes that it would be desirable to standardize these provisions by securing in some way the adoption of a uniform rule to be applied by all States. In this direction, the Uniform Division of Income for Tax Purposes Act was approved by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association during their annual meetings in July 1957. The uniform act deals with the allocation and apportionment of income of multistate businesses. I am not aware of any such action on any similar proposal with respect to personal or individual State income taxes. Except for the adoption of reciprocal credits, little progress has been made in developing uniform jurisdictional rules in the individual income tax field. This has been due to the large number of jurisdictions involved, the great diversity in treatment among the States, and the lack of any coordinating group to bring the various jurisdictions together.

Reciprocal credits, moreover, have not universally been looked upon as an unmixed blessing. One of the arguments against the use of the tax credit to solve problems in the area of intergovernmental fiscal relations is that the credit does not eliminate the wastes of duplicate administration and duplicate costs of compliance. A major weakness in the crediting systems which usually are utilized or proposed as a means of eliminating the double taxation resulting from dual jurisdictional claims where the taxpayer lives in one State and all or part of his income comes from sources in another State is that the impact of the systems is such that the taxpayer always is taxed at the rate imposed by the State having the higher tax rate and that no relief at all is provided if the State of residence does not impose an income tax. This latter, of course, is the unhappy posture of the New Jersey resident employed in New York or Philadelphia.

Mr. Tully, nevertheless, is a strong proponent of tax credits. He says that despite its shortcomings and disadvantages, the crediting device should not be discarded merely because it is not in itself a complete

solution for every aspect of intergovernmental fiscal problems. He is correct, of course, in the sense that the tax crediting device is better than no solution at all. It would be a serious blunder, however, if we permitted the existence, or the possibility, of tax credits to blind us to the possibility of better solutions. Half a loaf may be better than none—or perhaps worse than none if it causes us to falter in our pursuit of the full loaf. Most of the plans proposed for the elimination of double State taxation on incomes would achieve this result at the expense of different groups in the country according to which method was adopted. Furthermore, most of the various proposed plans, as well as the existing plans, provide no relief at all for the individual who receives all or part of his income from sources within a State in which he is not resident, if the State in which he is resident chooses to raise its tax revenues by means other than a personal income tax.

Is it possible that one solution to the problem could be to have incomes fixed inclusively by the Federal Government and the revenues shared with the States on the basis of some equitable formula? Despite a certain surface charm, this idea really is not worth serious consideration. If past experience in Federal-State relationships is any valid criterion, this "solution" would raise more problems than it would solve.

A far better solution comes from Professor Fisher, who suggests a novel dual-tax theory which would treat the income tax as a dual tax, one part of which is levied by the State of residence as a personal tax and the other part of which is levied by the State where the income has its source as a tax upon the process of income creation. This, he believes, would provide a relatively simple, fair solution to the problem of the rights of both the State of residence and the State of origin of the income. He says: "The legitimate claims of both States would be recognized, complicated credit provisions would be eliminated, and no taxpayer would be penalized because his residence and income-producing activities are not confined to one State."

VI. SOME PROPOSED SOLUTIONS TO THE NEW JERSEY PROBLEM

From time to time various proposals are advanced to mitigate the plight of the New Jersey resident who earns his living in New York or Philadelphia. Recently, on April 11, 1960, a joint resolution was introduced into the General Assembly of the New Jersey Legislature to make application to the Congress of the United States for the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to provide that no State or political subdivision thereof shall have the power to impose any tax on the income of nonresidents. There would seem to be little hope for the success of this approach, since 32 States now impose an income tax on nonresidents—far more than enough to block any constitutional amendment. Indeed, no significant action was taken on this joint resolution by the 1960 New Jersey Legislature, and no similar legislation has thus far been introduced into the 1961 legislature.

On February 6, 1961, Senator THOMAS J. Dodd, of Connecticut, introduced into the U.S. Senate a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with reference to income taxes on nonresidents. This resolution is the same as one which Senator Dodd previously had introduced into the 86th Congress. It would not ban taxation of income of nonresidents, but, rather, it would empower Congress to eliminate the inequities in such taxation. There would not seem to be much greater practical hope for the successful enactment of such an amendment than for one resulting in complete prohibition. Indeed, to date,

the Committee on the Judiciary, to which it was referred, has not taken any action.

The State of New Jersey Commission on Out-of-State Taxation of New Jersey Residents was established by the New Jersey Legislature in 1958 to consider the complaints of New Jersey residents against discriminatory treatment under the income tax law of the State of New York and with respect to the municipal wage taxes in the State of Pennsylvania. It is too soon to tell what the total impact of that Commission will be.

Late in 1959 the problem received a great deal of serious attention. On December 29, 1959, Governor Rockefeller of New York met with Governor Meyner of New Jersey and Governor Ribicoff of Connecticut to discuss various proposals to provide some relief for New York's nonresident taxpayers. Unfortunately, no concrete result satisfactory to all three States came out of that meeting.

New York officials frequently take the position that New York will consider some relief for nonresident taxpayers only if their State of residence enters into an interstate compact to permit employers within such State to withhold income taxes from New York residents employed in those States and to authorize each party State to bring suit in the other State to enforce collection of taxes. Fortunately, Governor Rockefeller has not taken that position. Although there may be much merit in the proposal that New Jersey and Connecticut so cooperate with New York, it is unreasonable to make such cooperation the quid pro quo for legitimate relief for New York's nonresident taxpayers.

Nearly every article on the impact on nonresidents of the New York personal income tax concerns itself in very large measure with the issue of deductions. There is a great deal of discussion of the inequities involved in not permitting nonresidents to itemize and take as deductions many items of a kind which residents may itemize as deductions. But much of this discussion seems to be at the expense of the more basic issues. While the New Jersey resident does not pay an income tax on his income earned in New York or elsewhere to the State of New Jersey, he does pay a variety of other taxes, particularly property taxes, which are required to support all levels of government in his home State. If New York were to allow a New Jersey taxpayer the full benefit of itemizing deductions, it would still be far less than the credit New York now allows residents of States levying income taxes, which is a full tax credit to the extent that the resident of another State pays income taxes equal to those he might pay in New York State. Thus, it follows that this is a problem more worthy of attention than the lesser, but more obvious, issue of unequal treatment on deductions.

An interstate compact has been advanced by some as the preferred solution to the income tax problems besetting New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. Others have suggested either an interstate compact or reciprocal legislation. Still others see a solution to the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut problem and similar problems in a "massive research project." Finally, one occasionally hears the idea advanced—sometimes in jest, sometimes seriously—that New Jersey adopt an income tax, or a tax measured by income, to be imposed only upon nonresidents who have sources of income in New Jersey. Whatever might be said in justification of such a retaliatory provision, it would not be valid, under the U.S. Constitution, for New Jersey to impose a personal income tax on nonresidents in the absence of a similar impost of its own citizens.

VII. THE PROPOSED EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION TAX ACT

An entirely new approach to New Jersey's problem was unveiled on May 2, 1960, when,

with Governor Meyner's support, a bill was introduced into the general assembly of the New Jersey Legislature for the imposition, for a limited period, of an emergency tax for transportation purposes, measured by income derived by residents of New Jersey from sources within another State with respect to which there is a critical transportation problem interstate and by residents of such other State from sources within New Jersey.

The act would provide for withholding of taxes by every employer in New Jersey of a taxpayer subject to the State tax on income derived from sources within New Jersey. This would apply even though the taxpayer is a resident of some State other than New Jersey. The real key to the act is the provision that a person otherwise subject to the tax and to the withholding requirement may be relieved of tax liability to New Jersey if he is resident in a State which allows reciprocity credits and such State withholds taxes with respect to New Jersey residents whose source of income is in such State, and makes payment of such sum to New Jersey. The effect of the act, therefore, would be that a person subject to the act would pay a personal income tax only to the State of his residence, and he would receive a credit from a State in which his income had its source but in which he was nonresident. Of course, as a practical matter the latter State would require his employer to withhold appropriate sums from his salary or wages, and such sums then would be paid to the State of his residence.

The Sunday following the introduction of the bill Governor Meyner admitted frankly that the measure is a matter of expediency. He described it as the "Commuter Benefit Tax." Its purpose, he said, is to help transportation. It would be temporary in nature, expiring by its own terms in 1970. He believes that the people who commute across a State line (e.g., those who live in New Jersey and work in New York, and those who live in New York and work in New Jersey) constitute a taxable class. This, as might be expected, is the single aspect of the bill which has received the greatest attention. It cannot be denied that, on this point, there is a serious question as to the validity of the tax.

If the bill should be enacted into law we can expect to see litigation to test its validity. To be valid, a tax measure need not tax everyone. Various classes can be exempted, or conversely a tax measure can impose its burden only on a limited class or group of classes. In either case, however, the classes established may not be unreasonably discriminatory. It is manifest that the drafters of the bill have attempted to avoid this pitfall. The bill would raise revenues earmarked for particular purposes. The revenues would be raised by a tax imposed upon a class, including both residents and nonresidents, which would especially benefit from the purposes for which the revenues are earmarked. Nonresidents who fall within the class (i.e., interstate commuters) would be treated no worse than residents who fall within the same class. If the bill is enacted into law, we can expect that it will not be long before its validity is tested in the courts. Even if, based upon the above and other factors, the validity of the tax should be sustained, it would not be entirely unexpected if New York were to take the position that it is not an "income" tax and thus does not qualify as the basis for reciprocal credits under the New York law. If this issue were raised we can anticipate seeing it, too, finally decided only in the courts. Governor Meyner says he expects the tax to produce for New Jersey revenues of at least \$25 million a year, and perhaps as much as \$38 million a year, now going to New York. No matter how compelling, in equity and justice, New Jersey's claim to this money may be, it is not likely that New York will give it up without a struggle.

If all else fails, it is not inconceivable that New York would give serious consideration to repealing the reciprocal credits provisions of its tax law. It is unlikely, however, that New York actually would go through with this, because, if it did, the 50,000 to 70,000 New Yorkers who work in New Jersey automatically would lose their rights to credits under the New Jersey law, because those credits are bottomed on reciprocity. Those New Yorkers then would find themselves paying taxes to two States—ironically, the same position New Jersey residents working in New York have been in for 42 years. Therefore, these New Yorkers could be expected to be a potent force on their legislature to keep this from happening. Consequently, while it is possible that New York will repeal its reciprocal credits provision, it is not probable.

VIII. CONCLUSION

New Jersey never has imposed a general personal income tax. For reasons not within the scope of this article, it seems unlikely that it will impose such a tax in the foreseeable future. Thus, other solutions must be sought to the New Jersey tax dilemma.

The Proposed Emergency Transportation Tax Act is a bold step in that direction. Without a doubt, however, it has a rocky road ahead of it. As this is written, it has not yet been passed by the New Jersey Legislature, and opposition to it quickly developed in the Senate of that body. If the measure gets over that hurdle, it seems assured of the present Governor's signature. But then we can look forward to seeing it in the courts for several years. If it survives the courts, there remains the possibility of retaliatory measures by the New York lawmakers.

One thing must not be forgotten: If the proposed law should survive all of these threats to its existence, validity, and vitality, it still would not provide any direct personal relief to the New Jersey resident who now pays an income tax to New York. As far as he is concerned the only change would be that, in addition to all his other taxes, he would be paying an income tax to New Jersey, instead of to New York.

It may be that we never will see the Emergency Transportation Tax Act in force, but the very proposal may help to narrow and sharpen the issues and thus hasten the day when New Jersey finally will find its way out of its tax dilemma.

Heartless Firing of Government Workers for Political Reasons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we on our side of the aisle are, of course, very much aware of the way the Kennedy administration plays politics. They are especially skilled in the art of patronage, as evidenced by the heartless firings of thousands of Government workers for political reasons.

But when the Post Office Department without turning a hair tosses out a 100 percent disabled war veteran who has done an outstanding job as acting postmaster, I think all of us should rise up and protest.

What price must a man pay to receive fair and reasonable treatment from his

country? Do we as Americans owe a debt of gratitude to a man who was presented the Bronze Star Medal by the President of the United States for taking command of a unit in the invasion of Saipan, who alone in the face of enemy fire strung communication lines on the battle front, who as a result of his bravery was struck by a 9-millimeter Japanese shell and was so mortally wounded that his fellow marines left him for dead on the beach of Saipan for 5 days?

This man, Mr. Speaker, is Thomas C. Smith, Jr., acting postmaster of El Cajon, Calif. As a result of his wounds, this former marine is today a 100-percent disabled veteran. He is partially paralyzed on his left side, but this paralysis is relatively unnoticed and has not interfered with the performance of his duties.

Since returning to civilian life, Tom Smith has distinguished himself with unselfish devotion to community activities of every nature. His interest in public service was climaxed early in 1960 when the postmaster of El Cajon, Calif., retired and Tom Smith was appointed as acting postmaster.

Although he wears many medals, including the Purple Heart, are we to conclude that he cannot serve because he did not wear a Kennedy button?

I can well appreciate that it is not enough that a man be a war hero nor that he have a desire to serve his country in war and in peace, but there must be other elements necessary, particularly in a position as important as that of postmaster. In this instance, I speak of the executive capabilities required, and I am pleased to report that Mr. Smith has been exemplary in the discharge of his responsibilities during his term of office and has received the commendations of not only his supervisors in the Post Office Department, but his employees as well.

The support for Mr. Smith is not of a partisan nature. Republican and Democrats alike have contacted me, expressing their indignation at this grossly unfair treatment of this 100 percent disabled American veteran. The veterans community of the city of El Cajon and the county of San Diego are seriously concerned with this dismissal of Mr. Smith. This whole problem is further compounded by the fact that the San Diego County Democrat Central Committee has selected a nonveteran as their patronage choice to replace Mr. Smith in this political maneuver.

Mr. Speaker, I ask to include at this point some of the letters and telegrams I have received from veterans organizations, plus high ranking civic leaders in the area. The civic leaders include the mayor of El Cajon, who forwarded a copy of his telegram of August 4, 1961, to President Kennedy. His letter reads as follows:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
CITY OF EL CAJON,
El Cajon, Calif., August 9, 1961.
Hon. ROBERT C. WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Following is the text of a telegram sent on August 4, 1961, by me to President Kennedy:

August 17

"The President, Washington, D.C. Please retain Mr. Tom Smith as postmaster of El Cajon postal department. During the past year Mr. Smith's performance in this capacity has been excellent, reflecting an intense interest in furthering postal services extended to the citizens of El Cajon, Calif. This fine quality creates good public relations both from the city's standpoint and that of the Federal Government. Mr. Smith has served his country in the armed services prior to becoming postmaster and is a disabled war veteran. It seems only logical that men of his experience performing credible duties in a Federal agency as important as the U.S. Postal Department should certainly be retained. Your serious consideration of Mr. Smith for the appointment of postmaster for the city of El Cajon and valley is respectfully requested."

Your assistance in Congress helping our city retain the services of Mr. Thomas C. Smith, Jr., as postmaster because of his outstanding service to his country and our community will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

KARL R. TUTTLE, Mayor.

Mr. Speaker, also, I have a letter from the mayor of Coronado, Calif., Robin Goodenough, which reads, as follows:

CITY OF CORONADO, CALIF.

August 9, 1961.

Congressman BOB WILSON,
30th Congressional District, State of California.

DEAR BOB: By this time you are undoubtedly familiar with the case of Tom C. Smith, Jr. Your appointment of this disabled veteran was a wonderful service to both the Government and to the man.

Certainly the continuation of this man in his position as postmaster is far above the issue of party and patronage. He has served his country far above and beyond the vast majority of Federal appointees. As a result of his war service he has a severe handicap in getting any sort of reasonable employment. He is well qualified in his present position. His removal would cast a severe shadow over our present administration.

There is a strong wave of bipartisan sentiment sweeping across the county in support of this veteran's plight. I'm certain you can ascertain this readily and will communicate the same to your fellow Members of Congress. In any event, we know we can count on you to do every possible thing to help this veteran who has given so much, and at the same time to avoid a tragic mistake on the part of the Federal Government.

Cordially yours,

ROBIN GOODENOUGH,
Mayor.

Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully, under unanimous consent, include at the conclusion of these remarks the following communications in behalf of Mr. Smith:

Copy of the citation for Bronze Star Medal.

Military Order of World Wars, La Jolla Chapter, by Comdr. Alfred A. Gregory.

American Legion, 22d district of California, by Comdr. C. M. Meech.

Disabled American Veterans, San Diego Chapter No. 2, by R. J. Cosgriff, adjutant.

Regular Veterans Association of the United States of America, by Rev. Frank B. Gigliotti, past national commander.

Military Order of the Purple Heart, San Diego Chapter No. 49, by Comdr. Alex Zauri.

Also, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous

consent, I include herewith an article that appeared in the July 29, 1961, issue of the San Diego Evening Tribune and an article that appeared in the August 6, 1961, issue of the San Diego Union.

Also, examples of the indignation expressed by the citizens of San Diego, copies of telegrams and letters directed to the President, as well as letters and telegrams I have received from private citizens in Mr. Smith's behalf:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D.C.

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Bronze Star Medal to 2d Lt. Thomas C. Smith, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For heroic achievement as assistant commander of the 81-mm. Platoon, 2d Battalion, 8th Marines, 2d Marine Division, during operations against enemy Japanese forces on Saipan, Marianas Islands, on June 15, 1944. Occupying an amphibious tractor which was guiding three others into the beach when the tractor commander became a casualty, Second Lieutenant Smith immediately assumed command and fearlessly exposed himself to heavy enemy fire in order to guide the vehicles to the beach during the initial landing on the enemy-held island. With his platoon completely isolated from the remainder of the battalion, he skillfully reorganized his men and directed them to fighting positions. Braving intense hostile small-arms, artillery, and mortar fire, he personally laid communications wire from his exposed position to the battalion headquarters although painfully wounded twice en route. While at battalion headquarters, he pointed out the positions of enemy guns, which were firing on his unit. Returning to his platoon, he sustained critical wounds and was subsequently evacuated. By his courageous leadership, aggressive fighting spirit and unwavering devotion to duty, Second Lieutenant Smith served to inspire all who observed him and upheld the highest traditions of the U.S. Naval Service."

Second Lieutenant Smith is authorized to wear the Combat "V."

For the President:

Secretary of the Navy.

AUGUST 13, 1961.

To advise that staff of the Military Order of World Wars is urging retention of Capt. Thomas C. Smith, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps (retired), as postmaster, El Cajon, Calif., who not only has done a commendable job as incumbent but in recognition of his valiant battlefield service in behalf of our country. Letter follows:

Comdr. ALFRED A. GREGORY,
U.S. Navy, Retired, Commander of La Jolla Chapter of Military Order of World Wars.

AUGUST 10, 1961.

The Military Order of the Purple Heart, chapter 49, and the department of California at a regular meeting March 7, 1961, and the annual State department meeting February 18, 1961, unanimously endorsed and recommended by resolution the retention of Comrade Patriot Thomas C. Smith, Jr., combat disabled Marine Corps hero, for postmaster in El Cajon, Calif.

Therefore, this chapter 49, Military Order of the Purple Heart of San Diego, and all other chapters, department of California, respectfully request you, the duly elected representative of the people, place a request before Congress of the United States of America for approval.

ALEX ZAURI,
Commander, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Chapter 49.

AUGUST 8, 1961.

San Diego Chapter 2, Disabled American Veterans, at a regular meeting in April 1961, unanimously endorsed Tom C. Smith for appointment to postmaster at El Cajon, Calif. Tom, a member of this chapter, is a World War II combat disabled veteran and recipient of the Bronze Star for saving 42 lives at Saipan. We the members of chapter 2 hereby reaffirm our previous endorsement of Tom and urge the appointment of this World War II disabled veteran to the postmastership of El Cajon, Calif.

R. J. COSGRIFF,
Adjutant, San Diego Chapter 2,
Disabled Veterans.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Hon. BOB WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The American Legion is strongly opposed to the replacement of a disabled veteran as postmaster of El Cajon by a nonveteran and request your assistance in preventing this replacement.

C. M. MEECH,
Commander, 22d District, American Legion, Department of California.

REGULAR VETERANS
ASSOCIATION OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC.,
Washington, D.C., August 8, 1961.

Hon. BOB WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: I am amazed and somewhat disappointed in the fact that so much undue pressure has been brought upon one of the outstanding heroes of our country's struggle for freedom, Acting Postmaster Tom Smith of El Cajon, who is an outstanding citizen as well as having given of himself to our country in time of battle so that he has been classified by our Government as totally and permanently disabled. If we are to treat men who devote and dedicate themselves to our country's welfare in time of war as some folks are attempting to treat Captain Smith, then there will be a question in the minds of those of future generations whether it will be worthwhile to sacrifice life, limb, and oneself for the preservation of our institutions and our altars.

Making political footballs of devoted servants of our country is not in keeping with the best spirit that makes it possible for a democracy to live. I hope that you can take Tom's case to the floor of Congress, and see to it that Captain Smith is given justice, and that he remains as postmaster of El Cajon, where he has done an excellent job.

With devotion to the principles of freedom, justice, and democracy, I remain.

Your friend,

FRANK B. GIGLIOTTI, D.D.
Past National Commander, Regular Veterans Association.

[From the San Diego Evening Tribune,
July 29, 1961]

ACTING POSTMASTER OUSTED IN EL CAJON
EL CAJON.—Thomas C. Smith, Jr., acting postmaster here for the last year, said today he has been dismissed from his job.

"I am a Republican," Smith said. "I guess I just belong to the wrong party."

Smith, who was appointed by President Eisenhower, through Representative Bob Wilson, Republican, San Diego, said he received a letter from Frederick Belen, assistant postmaster general, saying Smith's services would no longer be required.

"In effect it gave me 2 weeks' notice," Smith said.

Smith is 100 percent disabled but gets around without a wheelchair or crutches. We was wounded in World War II.

He was a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps and went ashore in the second wave of Marines at Saipan in a tank, he said.

"I got fragments of a 90-millimeter shell in my head and laid on the beach for dead 5 days," he said. "Finally, someone noticed signs of life and salvaged me."

Smith is partially paralyzed in the left arm and leg and lost the use of his left hand. This has not interfered with his duties, he said.

PROMOTED TO CAPTAIN

Smith was promoted to captain when he left the service and has received the Purple Heart and Bronze Star in lieu of a Navy Cross. Before Saipan, he had served in Iceland and Africa.

Recommendations that he be retained as postmaster have been sent by city and county officials from El Cajon and San Diego and from leading citizens throughout the State.

One of his last official acts was to recommend a new post office building for El Cajon.

[From the San Diego Union, Aug. 6, 1961]

POSTMASTER BEING REPLACED NOTES ACCOMPLISHMENTS

(By Nick Williams)

EL CAJON.—Tom Smith, Jr., will step down as acting postmaster of El Cajon within a week—leaving, he hopes, the seed of a quadrupled post office here.

The Post Office Department last week notified Smith he would be replaced within 2 weeks ending a 1-year term as acting postmaster. Congress has yet to confirm a replacement for Smith.

Smith, a much-decorated World War II veteran, yesterday said he hopes to leave office with plans for a new post office underway.

"I saw the need for a new facility as soon as I took office," Smith said. "It is tremendously difficult to work in the cramped (7,000 square feet) space of the present post office.

"On my recommendation, the Department made a study for a new facility. I think the postmaster will accept it readily."

Smith said the proposed 28,000-square-foot post office, if accepted, will be completed within 2 years. He said it will allow postal workers to operate efficiently for at least 10 years.

HIGH SCHOOL COURSE

Smith, of 1790 Garrison Way, also cited a post office personnel administration course he formed for operation in the fall semester at Granite Hills High School. Twenty 2-hour courses will be conducted by post office instructors in the adult education division. Regular and prospective post office employees are expected to attend.

During his term, the post office also was raised from grade 11 to grade 12, the second highest grade post office in the county. Grade increases, Smith said, are measured by efficiency, number of employees, and Government vehicles and total receipts.

Smith said he had made no plans for the immediate future.

The acting postmaster still suffers partial paralysis on the left side from wounds suffered in World War II during the landing of the 2d Marine Division on Saipan.

SERVED IN ICELAND

He entered the Corps as a second lieutenant and served with a combat unit in Iceland in 1941 and early 1942. In the spring of 1942 he was intelligence officer of the staff of the admiral of the Atlantic Fleet during landings in North Africa where he later went ashore and endured the shellings at Casablanca, Rabat, and Dakar.

He returned to the States for training at Camp Elliott and shipped to New Zealand to join the 8th Marine Regiment.

By then a first lieutenant and infantry company commander, Smith took part in the bloody landing on Tarawa.

In June 1944 he was assistant commander when his mortar unit streamed toward the Saipan beaches in amphibious trucks. His commanding officer was killed before he reached the beach and Smith took command and brought the trucks to the beach where he reorganized the unit in an isolated area.

He led a wire team through enemy lines to link communication with his battalion headquarters where he briefed commanders on Japanese positions. He was struck in the left leg by small arms fire during this action.

Returning through the lines to command his unit, Smith was felled by a Japanese mortar shell which sent shrapnel into his arms, legs, shoulders, and the back of the head.

The Smiths have two children, William, 11, and Melinda, 9.

NATIONAL CITY, CALIF., August 7, 1961.

HON. BOB WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: As soon as I saw in the newspapers the news of the action of the Post Office Department in relieving Mr. Thomas C. Smith, Jr., acting postmaster in El Cajon, Calif., I sent a protest of this action to that Department in Washington. It seemed to me to be a rather summary action against a wounded veteran of World War II who almost died on the beaches of Saipan in the service of this Nation.

The mail today brought the enclosed reply which does not seem satisfactory to me. The whole thing smacked to me of politics. If anything can yet be done for this man I think it should be done.

Gratefully yours,

W. R. VAIDEN.

EL CAJON, CALIF.

MR. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is a generally accepted practice for political appointees to be replaced when a new administration is inaugurated. However, in some cases this serves no useful purpose and in the case to which this letter refers, perpetrates a grave injustice.

Thomas Smith, of El Cajon, Calif., was appointed acting postmaster. He has done a very creditable job of improving the efficiency of the local post office and has earned the respect of his fellow workers and of the townspeople.

Mr. Smith has a war record almost equal to that of Mr. President but he is now being replaced by the former assistant postmaster who, so far as this writer knows, has had no organizational or executive experience except that gained in his present job and when he operated a small gas station with a partner.

We all have reason to be grateful for our partisan type of government. This writer is a Republican but a staunch supporter of Mr. Kennedy in his high office as the President of the United States because the majority of our citizens elected him to that office.

Now then, could Mr. President not delegate someone to correct this unhappy situation and hold Mr. Smith as postmaster of El Cajon, Calif.?

Respectfully,

LEAH McMAHON.

EL CAJON, CALIF.
August 8, 1961.

HON. BOB WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Hoping you will put up a good fight in Washington for our El Cajon Postmaster Tom Smith; 100-percent disabled American war veteran with an outstanding record in

the service of his country; an outstanding record in the service of his community; and an outstanding record in the service of his job. And let's not forget the fellow countrymen who gave their blood to keep us free.

RUSS CRANE,
FRANK FOX.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.
Congressman BOB WILSON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILSON: I read in the San Diego newspapers about Thomas Smith, postmaster of El Cajon, losing his position and I think that this is terrible. A man who had defended his country as this man has should certainly be retained.

I am a registered Democrat and I believe that in this man's case that party affiliations should not be considered, just because he is a Republican is not enough reason to replace him. Republicans are Americans too.

I am for America and all good Americans regardless of party.

I hope that the Democratic administration will be fair in this man's case.

Respectfully yours,

ARLA MCCLURE.

AUGUST 9, 1961.

HON. BOB WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The members of the Better Government Association of San Diego wish to go on record for the retention of Mr. Thomas C. Smith, Jr., as postmaster of El Cajon, Calif.

Mr. Smith served his country with honor in time of war, and we believe that it is time to forget party politics and let him know that America is proud of the sacrifice he made for our country.

Yours truly,

WILLARD B. STEELMAN,
President, Better Government Association,
San Diego, Calif.

AUGUST 9, 1961.

The Honorable ROBERT WILSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Tom Smith, our local postmaster for the city of El Cajon, has been notified of his discharge from the service.

To my personal knowledge, Mr. Smith is an outstanding administrator, excellent in public relations, and an all around fine individual. We feel that Mr. Smith has served his country well. He has suffered for his service strong physical discomfort and as such, we feel that this is a poor reward for what he has been through.

I, therefore, respectfully request that additional consideration be given to the action of his discharge, and that he be restored to his former office.

Very truly yours,

J. C. O'CONNOR,
Chief of Police, City of El Cajon.

The Vicious Attack by Fabian Socialists on Anti-Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, Fabian Socialists are today making a concerted effort to destroy those of us who